Table 4-1. Responses to Comments			
Ltr#	**Cmt#**	**Comment**	**Response**
1100	1	As a wholesale customer of SFPUC that purchases 100% of its potable water supply from the San Francisco Regional Water System, water supply available to the MPMWD [Menlo Park Municipal Water District] under the SED proposal could be reduced more than 50% under drought conditions for multiple consecutive years.	Please see Master Response 8.5, Assessment of Potential Effects on the San Francisco Bay Area Regional Water System, regarding the State Water Board's evaluation of potential reductions in water supply and associated economic considerations and other impacts within the SFPUC Regional Water System (RWS) service area with implementation of the plan amendments. The master response identifies the main points of disagreement or differing assumptions between the SED and the comments. As described in Master Response 8.5, the SED identified reasonably foreseeable actions that could be taken by affected entities to comply with the plan amendments and in response to reduced surface water supplies. These actions did not include the severe mandatory rationing described by SFPUC because it was not reasonably foreseeable that a water supplier would impose drastic mandatory water rationing on its customers without first attempting other actions to replace any reductions in water supplies with alternative sources of water, such as through water transfers.
1100	2	MPMWD [Menlo Park Municipal Water District] has made significant strides in water conservation in the past 10 years. Total water use decreased 31.5% from 3.25 million gallons per day (MGD) to 2.23 MGD.	The State Water Board acknowledges the MPMWD's water conservation effort and ongoing commitment to demand management. The comment does not raise significant environmental issues or make a general comment regarding the plan amendments.
1100	3	Based on our 2015 Urban Water Management Plan, a 50% cut to water supply would force MPMWD [Menlo Park Municipal Water District] to take a number of significant actions including developing water budgets for all water accounts and notifying account holders, and not approving new potable water connections, new temporary meters or permanent meters, except under special circumstances.	Please see response to comment 1100-1.
1100	4	MPMWD [Menlo Park Municipal Water District] serves water to 3,600 residential customers and over 250 businesses and other non-residential customers. Potential consequences of the SED proposal include health and safety concerns due to lack of potable supplies, major job losses, slower economic growth and delayed community development in our service area. Since outdoor use represents a relatively small proportion of our commercial, industrial, and institutional account water demand, commercial, industrial and institutional customers generally have fewer opportunities to reduce water use without changing their operations or incurring significant economic impacts.	Please see responses to comments 1100-1. Please also see Master Response 8.5, regarding economic considerations, growth, and demand management. Please refer to Master Response 3.6, Service Providers, regarding Water Code section 106, minimum health and safety needs and a broad discussion regarding conservation. Please refer to Master Response 2.1, Amendments to the Water Quality Control Plan, for additional discussion regarding health and safety and the emergency provision.
1100	5	MPMWD [Menlo Park Municipal Water District] relies 100% on SFPUC water. MPMWD's only other emergency supply is via interconnections with adjacent water agencies. However, these adjacent water agencies also rely primarily on SFPUC water, so a 50% cut to SFPUC water would be detrimental to our system's ability to provide water to our customers.	Please see response to comment 1100-1.
1100	6	In lights of these aforementioned impacts as well as those articulated in the BAWSCA and SFPUC comment letters incorporated here by reference, the MPMWD [Menlo Park Municipal Water District] requests that environmental and economic impacts of any shortage on the San Francisco Regional Water System, and the associated lost jobs and delayed development, be fully and adequately analyzed as part of the SWRCB's proposed flow alternatives. Such full and adequate analysis should be given at least equal weight with all other elements of the SWRCB's subsequent deliberations and decision making.	Please see responses to comments 1100-1 and 1100-4. Please also see Master Response 8.5, , Assessment of Potential Effects on the San Francisco Bay Area Regional Water System, for a discussion regarding economic considerations, growth effects, environmental effects based on a rationing-only approach, and demand management. To the extent that this comment letter raises similar issues or the same issues raised by SFPUC or BAWSCA, please refer to letter 1166 or letter 1191 to review responses to those letters.
1100	7	The Governor has indicated his strong support for negotiated voluntary agreements to resolve these issues. We [Menlo Park Municipal Water District] request that the SWRCB	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for information regarding voluntary agreements and

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments			
Ltr#	**Cmt#**	**Comment**	**Response**
		provide adequate time for voluntary agreements to be reached amongst the stakeholders prior to any action on the SED. Please give this settlement process a chance for success instead of expediting implementation of the current proposal. We share BAWSCA's commitment to continue working closely with the diverse interests and stakeholders to develop that shared solution.	collaboration with agencies.
1101	1	There is no scientific evidence that additional water flow will increase or benefit the fish population. Have we not learned anything from the last several years of drought? Conservation plus storage can carry us through the next dry spell. If you have extra money, you don't roll down the window on the freeway and start releasing dollar bills out the window. No, you SAVE that money for a time when funds are low. This isn't rocket science, folks.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1101	2	May I remind you that the Central Valley grows approximately 80% of the USA's fruits and vegetables? Without water, how do you think those crops will be cultivated and grown? They won't. Farmers will let land run fallow because there is no water available in their water district, thus decreasing supply and increasing the price to consumers. Or, alternatively, the water districts could unjustly spike the cost of water per acre-feet to the farmers and the farmers have no choice but to raise their prices to distributors which in tum passes that cost on to consumers. All because someone, who has probably never set foot on an agricultural farm, suggested that there is a sad fish somewhere and they thought it needed more water. Wrong.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1101	3	Human existence takes priority over an unproven suggestion to help a fish. Fish have existed for millions of years, long before we inhabited the Central Valley, they have somehow managed to survive through drought and flood. The fish will continue to survive without wasting billions of acre-feet of water our residents, our agriculture and our economy desperately need. It's very simple ... STORAGE > FISH.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1102	1	I am opposed to your plan to increase flows in the Stanislaus and other rivers. That water is needed for farming, cities for drinking water, recreation and lawns.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1103	1	"It is for the environment." We try to save the Delta smelt, but kill millions of jobs. Now we are trying to save the salmon, without killing anything. Your plan to increase river flows is going to hurt people ... again.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1104	1	I am opposed to your plan to increase unimpaired flows in the Stanislaus River. Your unfair water grab would damage the Central California economy.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1105	1	I am opposed to your intent to raise flows on the Stanislaus and two other rivers because of the economic impact it will have on the Central Valley.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1106	1	The most sustainable approach to this dilemma is to create incentives and also enforce more efficient irrigation systems in the agricultural industry.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1106	2	The current amount of water being used cannot be sustained. Laws need to be written and funds must be obtained to provide research to create the most water efficient irrigation methods for the agriculture industry. Dollars then need to be allotted to assist farmers to	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments			
Ltr#	**Cmt#**	**Comment**	**Response**
		convert to these more efficient irrigation systems.	
1107	1	As a wholesale customer of SFPUC that purchases 100% of its potable water supply from the San Francisco Regional Water System, water supply availability to PHWD under the SED proposal could be reduced more than 50% under drought conditions for multiple consecutive years.	Please see Master Response 8.5, Assessment of Potential Effects on the San Francisco Bay Area Regional Water System, regarding the State Water Board's evaluation of potential reductions in water supply and associated economic considerations and other impacts within the SFPUC Regional Water System (RWS) service area with implementation of the plan amendments. The master response identifies the main points of disagreement or differing assumptions between the SED and the comments. As described in Master Response 8.5, the SED identified reasonably foreseeable actions that could be taken by affected entities to comply with the plan amendments and in response to reduced surface water supplies. These actions did not include the severe mandatory rationing described by SFPUC because it was not reasonably foreseeable that a water supplier would impose drastic mandatory water rationing on its customers without first attempting other actions to replace any reductions in water supplies with alternative sources of water, such as through water transfers.
1107	2	Based on PHWD's recent experience, this significant cut to water supply would force PHWD to take a number of significant actions including, but not limited to, implementing a moratorium on new development in the service are, importing water, and minimizing nonessential uses of water so that water is available for human consumption, sanitation, and fire protection.	Please see responses to comments 1107-1.
1107	3	PHWD serves water to over 6,000 residential customers and over 10 businesses and other non-residential customers, including Foothill College. Potential consequences of the SED proposal include health and safety concerns due to lack of potable supplies, major job losses, slower economic growth and delayed community development in PHWD's service area as well as SFPUC Regional Water System's service area.	Please see responses to comments 1107-1. Please refer to Master Response 2.1, Amendments to the Water Quality Control Plan, for additional discussion regarding health and safety and the emergency provision. Please also see Master Response 3.6, Service Providers, for a discussion of Water Code Section 106 and water for minimum health and safety needs. Please also see Master Response 8.5, Assessment of Potential Effects on the San Francisco Bay Area Regional Water System, regarding economic considerations, growth effects, and demand management.
1107	4	In the light of these aforementioned impacts as well as those articulated in the BAWSCA and SFPUC comment letters incorporated here by reference, PHWD requests that environmental and economic impacts of any shortage on the San Francisco Regional Water System, and the associated lost jobs and delayed development, be fully and adequately analyzed as part of the SWRCB's proposed flow alternatives. Such full and adequate analysis should be given at least equal weight with all other elements of the SWRCB's subsequent deliberations and decision making	Please see responses to comments 1107-1 and 1107-3. Please also see Master Response 8.5, Assessment of Potential Effects on the San Francisco Bay Area Regional Water System, for a discussion regarding economic considerations, growth effects, environmental effects based on a rationing-only approach, and demand management. To the extent that this comment letter raises similar issues or the same issues raised by SFPUC or BAWSCA, please refer to letter 1166 or letter 1191 to review responses to those letters.
1107	5	The Governor has indicated his strong support for negotiated voluntary agreements to resolve these issues. PHWD requests that the SWRCB provide adequate time for voluntary agreements to be reached amongst the stakeholders prior to any action on the SED. Please give this settlement process a chance for success instead of expediting implementation of the current proposal. PHWD shares BAWSCA's commitment to continue working closely with the diverse interests and stakeholders to develop that shared solution.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for information regarding voluntary agreements and collaboration with agencies.
1108	1	I am definitely opposed to your plan to raise flows on the Stanislaus and two other rivers. The ecological and economic damage is far too great.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1109	1	I am opposed to your idea to increase unimpaired flows on the Stanislaus River. The harm, both short term and especially long term, far, far outweigh any possible gains. The risk of harm is much greater than the possible and highly disputed "help" this water will provide to the salmon. The possible negative effects on the water supply for thousands of	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments			
Ltr#	**Cmt#**	**Comment**	**Response**
		people must be recognized and dealt with.	
1110	1	ACWD [Alameda County Water District] supplies drinking water to over 349,000 residents and the businesses in the cities of Fremont, Newark, and Union City in southern Alameda County. ACWD has a diversified portfolio of water supplies which includes the San Francisco Regional Water System (RWS), State Water Project, and local groundwater and surface water. In addition, through implementation of our Integrated Resources Plan, ACWD has invested over $100M in innovative alternative water supplies and water management practices including brackish groundwater desalination, water use efficiency, conjunctive use groundwater recharge facilities, and off-site groundwater banking. ACWD was one of the founding member agencies of the California Urban Water Conservation Council had has invested heavily in water use efficiency.	The comment provided characteristics of the service area. Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment regarding the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1110	2	Over the past 10 years, ACWD's total per capita water use has decreased 33% from 156 gallons per capita per day (gpcd) to 104 gpcd.	The State Water Board acknowledges the Alameda County Water District's (ACWD's) water conservation effort and ongoing commitment to demand management. The comment does not raise significant environmental issues or make a general comment regarding the plan amendments.
1110	3	ACWD is making significant investments to ensure that its operations on Alameda Creek are conducted in an environmentally sustainable manner. To accommodate restoration of a steelhead (Oncorhynchus mykiss) fishery on Alameda Creek, ACWD is actively implementing a comprehensive fisheries program which includes construction of three fish ladders, removal of one inflatable rubber dam, and screening of all of our diversion facilities, with total investments in fisheries restoration projects exceeding $54M.	This comment provides information on the Alameda County Water District's contributions to improving conditions for steelhead in their service area. This comment does not raise a significant environmental issue or make a general comment regarding the plan amendments. No further response is required.
1110	4	ACWD's water supply reliability investments have reduced its dependence on imported supplies from the Delta and the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) from about 60% to currently just over 40%. Despite these significant investments, ACWD still relies on the RWS for roughly 20% or our portable water supply on average. Additionally, because of the dry year storage provided by the RWS, ACWD's reliance on SFPUC supply is highest in dry and critically dry periods, providing upwards of 30% of potable supply utilization.	The commenter is providing information regarding ACWD's wholesale sources of water. The comment does not raise significant environmental issues or make a general comment regarding the plan amendments.
1110	5	- Substantial increase in the frequency of supply shortfalls experienced by ACWD customer, from 1 in 16 years under current conditions to 1 in 6 years with SED. - A doubling in magnitude of water supply shortfall during critically dry years, from 10% to 20%. - Depletion of ACWD's groundwater bank in Semitropic, requiring the need to acquire new additional water supplies for purposes of banking to ensure water supply reliability during droughts. - Increased reliance on local groundwater stored in the Niles Cone Groundwater Basin, a coastal aquifer, particularly during droughts. This increases the probability for saltwater intrusion and degradation of the potable aquifer, becoming even worse as Climate Change induced sea-level rise occurs.	Please see Master Response 8.5, Assessment of Potential Effects on the San Francisco Bay Area Regional Water System, regarding the State Water Board's evaluation of potential reductions in water supply and associated economic considerations and other impacts within the SFPUC Regional Water System (RWS) service area with implementation of the plan amendments. The master response identifies the main points of disagreement or differing assumptions between the SED and the comments. As described in Master Response 8.5, the SED identified reasonably foreseeable actions that could be taken by affected entities to comply with the plan amendments and in response to reduced surface water supplies. These actions did not include the severe mandatory rationing described by SFPUC because it was not reasonably foreseeable that a water supplier would impose drastic mandatory water rationing on its customers without first attempting other actions to replace any reductions in water supplies with alternative sources of water, such as through water transfers. Please also see Master Response 8.5, Assessment of Potential Effects on the San Francisco Bay Area Regional Water System, regarding groundwater use. Finally, please also see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for a general discussion as to the approach to the analyses contained in the SED, and the programmatic nature of analysis, and Master Response 8.5, for a more specific discussion of programmatic analysis. To the extent that this comment letter raises similar issues or the same issues raised by SFPUC or BAWSCA,

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments			
Ltr#	**Cmt#**	**Comment**	**Response**
			please refer to letter 1166 or letter 1191 to review responses to those letters.
1110	6	ACWD questions the notion within the SED that any water supply shortfall can simply be mitigated with water transfers. Water transfers are temporary in nature, unpredictable in cost and quantity, complicated to obtain and implement, and are dependent on regulatory approvals. In 2015, and despite the State Water Resource Control Board's support (which we greatly appreciated), ACWD and the Contra Costa Water District were unable to execute a transfer of 5,000 AF of our own, secured water supply. Despite having all regulatory approvals, the Central Valley Project and State Water Project Coordinated Operations were not willing to execute the transfer due to temporary and unpredictable Delta flow conditions. By the time suitable conditions returned, the permits had expired. Given the uncertainties of water transfers, ACWD does not believe that dependence on unsecured transfers is a responsible approach to meet the needs of customers during normal, dry, and multiple dry water years.	Please see response to comment 1110-5.
1110	7	In the light of these aforementioned impacts, as well as those identified by Bay Area Water and Supply Conservation Agency (BAWSCA) and the SFPUC, ACWD requests that the environmental impacts of any shortage on the RWS, as well as the associated statewide, regional and local economic impacts to the Bay Area and ACWD's service area, be fully and adequately analyzed and considered as part of the SWRCB's proposed flow alternatives.	Please see responses to comment 1110-5. Please also see Master Response 8.5, Assessment of Potential Effects on the San Francisco Bay Area Regional Water System, for a discussion regarding economic considerations, growth effects, environmental effects based on a rationing-only approach, and demand management. To the extent that this comment letter raises similar issues or the same issues raised by SFPUC or BAWSCA, please refer to letter 1166 or letter 1191 to review responses to those letters.
1110	8	ACWD concurs with the Governor's support for negotiated voluntary agreements to resolve these issues and requests that the SWRCB provide adequate time for stakeholders prior to any SWRCB action on the SED. While ACWD certainly supports the importance of being a good steward of the environment, ACWD shares BAWSCA's commitment to continue working closely with the diverse interests and stakeholders to develop that shared solution.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for information regarding voluntary agreements and collaboration with agencies.
1111	1	I do not support your plan to raise unimpaired flows on the Stanislaus and other rivers. We need that water here.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1112	1	I do not support your plan to raise flows in the Stanislaus, Tuolumne and Merced rivers. We need to save our water to stop another drought situation in the State of California.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1113	1	Your proposal to increase river flows hypocritically suggests that farmers will make up for lost access to surface water by pumping more from already overstressed aquifers. Are you serious? That makes no sense. Please rethink your plan.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1114	1	The unfair water grab from the Stanislaus River will devastate local agriculture, local businesses, local economy, fish population and basically screw the region! I vehemently oppose this diversion, and any that divert water from Northern California regions, where local water supplies are critical to all the above.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1115	1	Environmental concerns need to include water conservation for agriculture. Farmers who provide almost half of the fresh fruit and vegetable for the nation are here in California. Farms depend on water. Unimpaired flows can affect water availability for farmers and can cause rationing. Now that it looks like the high speed rail project is all but terminated, let's focus on water storage and avoid the economic troubles that come with a water shortage.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1116	1	I am strongly opposed to additional flows down the Stanislaus River, as you have proposed. We need the agricultural benefits more than a few fish "maybe" saved.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments			
Ltr#	**Cmt#**	**Comment**	**Response**
1117	1	We need the water for agriculture, not for fish. There are other ways to help salmon, which your plan ignores.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1118	1	Our permanent crops cannot survive without a dependable water source. We need water to flow through the Delta whenever possible. It is the life blood of our farms and the agriculture industry statewide.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1119	1	As a retired environmental attorney who has represented private clients seeking to comply with water quality and CEQA requirements, I urge you to adopt a plan which sets flows at 50-60% levels in order to save the salmon and protect the entire river and delta system. Too much water would be sent to central valley farmers and Southern California populations. Not enough pressure has been put on these two populations to efficiently reduce their use of bay and river water.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1119	2	Southern California continues to grow recklessly without sound planning to provide sufficient water for the existing population. Southern California users must reduce their excessive water use while central valley farmers must become more efficient in using water that is now available. Draining of deep aquifers by farmers must also be limited or stopped. We cannot continue to grow forever without adopting a sustainable statewide lifestyle in California.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1120	1	The McClure Boat Club is a community of 63 homes located on the shores of Lake McClure. The Club operates a water treatment facility licensed by the State Water Resources Control Board. Our experiences during the drought have many parallels to the conditions the lake will face if the Bay- Delta Plan SED is implemented as written. The lake is the community's sole source of water. The drought caused us to look for alternatives and there are no other viable sources. A well is not possible within our property boundaries and trucking in water is the only alternative if the lake is made not usable by the SED. The community has been in existence since 1970 and is now predominantly populated by retired people that range in age to 97. The community itself is not disadvantaged, but several of the residents are. The community leans heavily on volunteer labor to keep costs down. The majority of the Club's budget and the majority of the volunteerism are in support of drinking water. Our water production costs grow tremendously as the lake level drops and the need for volunteer labor increase substantially. Maintaining our water intake platform and pipeline becomes treacherous as the lake level falls. The shoreline turns to rock cliffs and silt-filled valleys as the lake level drops. The Club received grant funding under funding agreement PDE-2210905-001 to help deal with the effects of the drought. Two projects were funded under the drought, additional storage tanks and revisions to our water intake platform and pipeline. The platform and pipeline work was done as a stopgap measure to get us past the drought. A far more robust system would be required if the SED is implemented. In the last year of the drought, there were three separate water pump failures and numerous pipeline leaks due to the low lake level and corresponding high head pressures. This small community can't afford to implement a water intake system robust enough to deal with low lake condition on an ongoing basis. Yet the SED will put the Club in exactly that situation.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1120	2	There is a direct relationship between [Lake McClure] level and raw water quality; there is also a direct relationship between the lake level fluctuation rate and raw water quality. The best raw water is observed when the lake is near full and at a relative steady level. In these	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments			
Ltr#	**Cmt#**	**Comment**	**Response**
		conditions we observe raw water turbidity measurements well under 1 NTU and have observed as low as .070 NTU. On the other end of the spectrum in low water conditions and a rapid rate of lake level change we observe turbidity readings in the double digits and have observed as high as 57.846 NTU. The significant rainfall in late 2016 and early 2017 caused the lake level to rise at a tremendous rate. It started rise with approximately 400,000 acre-feet in storage and added an addition 500,000. Through the time of rapidly increasing water levels we observed turbidity readings under 6 NTU. We supply daily turbidity data to Water Control Board in monthly reports. The quality of raw water is compromised below 400,000 acre-feet of storage in the lake and severely compromised when the lake is below 300,000 acre-feet of storage. The lake elevation is approximately 715 feet above sea level when 300,000 acre-feet are being stored. Below this level, silt-filled valleys become exposed and that silt gets washed into suspension during the next runoff. Worse yet, many old gold mining locations become exposed to runoff. These operations used mercury to separate out the gold and disturbing the sites causes the mercury levels in the water to increase. The plan is significantly flawed with its higher demand for water in dry years; the quality of water is compromised in these times and will cause more harm than good to the salmon. The quality of the raw water is visible to the human eye. In good conditions, fish can be seen swimming around in depths up to 20' [in Lake McClure]. In low water conditions the water is so cloudy there is no chance of seeing a fish. When the rains started late in 2015 the lake took on an ugly brown color. As is common, the lake developed a layer of silt filling the old river channel and the numerous valleys that supply runoff to the lake. The silt is made up of very fine particles of clay. These tiny light weight particles stay in suspension for a very long time. The water supplied to Lake McSwain, the Merced Falls Forebay and the Merced River had the same brown color. The point I'm trying to make is that the silt had infiltrated the lake at all levels and the quality of the water throughout the system was very low quality. The SED will routinely cause this same set of conditions to occur.	
1120	3	Some fish species can survive in dirty water, but trout and salmon cannot. The high turbidity condition on Lake McClure decimated the trout population. Their gills fill with silt and clear water is required to flush the silt away. The SED will cause these high turbidity conditions throughout the Merced River and will do more harm than good to the salmon. Are all fish equal? The SED has a slim chance of helping the Chinook salmon, but it harms all other species.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1120	4	It appears to me that the salmon have more of a survival problem rather than a spawn problem. Yet the SED only address the spawn part of the problem. An infinite flow rate won't fix the problem. Hatcheries on each of the tributaries would be the easiest way to address any spawn rate issue. The SED does nothing to address the bigger part of the problem and that is the survival rate of the salmon. There are numerous things killing off the salmon: pollution in many forms, predators, overfishing and habitat reduction. These all need to be addressed for the salmon to survive. The salmon will continue their decline if the SED is implemented as written.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1120	5	Any successful plan needs to be multi-faceted. It has to be as complex as the problems it is trying to solve. A specific plan needs to be developed for each river. Merced Irrigation	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments			
Ltr#	**Cmt#**	**Comment**	**Response**
		District's SAFE plan was developed with due diligence and will make a positive impact. The SED will do just the opposite. A successful plan will need to address the survival rate problem the salmon face. It will need to individually deal with each of the causes and will need to involve many of the branches of state government.	
1120	6	There was a thought shared at the Merced Public hearing that the SED spreads the pain equally. I completely disagree with that statement. The SED as written will take away this [Lake McClure] community's access to safe drinking water. It would force us to truck in water or to abandon our homes in dry years. Equal pain would be to divert 100% of Hetch Hetchy water to the San Joaquin and into the Delta. San Francisco could develop desalination plants for less money per capita than we could haul in water.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1120	7	The level of diligence and inclusion in the SED is shockingly low. Merced Irrigation District's SAFE plan is obviously more comprehensive and evolved. The Water Board needs to start the process over and include the stakeholder in developing a workable plan. I implore you to work with all parties to find a solution that will protect drinking water, that will protect food production, that will protect the fish and most importantly will protect the people.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1121	1	Implement a comprehensive science-based water plan that includes managing each watershed (including groundwater) as a unified whole and upgrading the Delta levee system.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1121	2	Fully protect all water sources from contamination and guarantee sufficient water for the basic human needs of drinking and sanitation.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1121	3	Motivate efficient, sustainable, safe use of water and hold all users accountable for their consumption; implement and enforce regulations regarding groundwater use including full usage documentation.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1121	4	Ensure allocation and management of water to sustain ecosystems, fisheries, recreation, and endangered species.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1121	5	We are concerned about the viability and health of fish, wildlife, and plant populations that depend on fresh, cool, flowing water in the Sacramento-San Joaquin River System. This includes both resident and migrating species. The entire river system drainage should be managed as a complete ecosystem. Its health depends, among other things, on the vigor of the salmon populations. These populations need to be boosted. The system is threatened by salt water intrusion into the Delta and by algae blooms that are toxic to people, plankton, and wildlife. In much of California, including Santa Clara County, human needs for clean, safe water depend on a healthy Sacramento-San Joaquin system.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1121	6	The 2010 State Water Board report titled Development of Flow Criteria for the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Ecosystem stated "In order to preserve the attributes of a natural variable system to which native fish species are adapted, many of the criteria developed by the State Water Board are crafted as percentages of natural or unimpaired flows. These criteria include: -- 75% of unimpaired Delta outflow from January through June;	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments			
Ltr#	**Cmt#**	**Comment**	**Response**
		-- 75% of unimpaired Sacramento River inflow from November through June; and -- 60% of unimpaired San Joaquin River inflow from February through June." Therefore, we urge you to set the flow at the needed levels of approximately 75% for Delta outlflow, 75% for Sacramento River inflow, and 60% for San Joaquin River inflow during the specified months.	
1122	1	The Revised SED has, in essence, two main proposals under consideration. The Lower San Joaquin River Flow Objective is the proposal that the Revised SED has put forth purportedly to benefit fish and wildlife. The SalSim model provides the only population level, quantitative estimate of the effects of the Revised SED on any fish species. Despite claims by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) and its staff that the SalSim model was not used in the analysis of the potential fish benefits, the Revised SED relies heavily on the SalSim model as "evidence" of the benefits of the proposed project. For example, on page 4-4 of the Revised SED it is stated that "The results of the temperature, floodplain, and SalSim evaluations indicate that as the percentage of unimpaired flow increases during the February-June time period, habitat conditions important to native fish can improve dramatically, and the number of adult salmon produced by the three eastside tributaries would be expected to increase substantially compared to baseline conditions during the time period of 1994-2010." Additionally , the Revised SED states on page 4-25 that "the State Water Board used SalSim to compare effects of unimpaired and baseline flows on fall-run Chinook salmon by evaluating potential changes in annual salmon production." The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) is the sponsor and creator, and correspondingly an expert user, of this model. On January 3, 2017, the CDFW provided comments at the Public Hearing in Sacramento about the Revised SED and the role of SalSim in the Revised SED's analysis. To briefly summarize, Mr. Dean Marston (CDFW) stated that the CDFW had discovered "errors" in the SalSim model since the SWRCB used it for the Revised SED analysis. Mr. Marston then stated that those errors have been corrected; the model has been recalibrated; and that the CDFW will submit the analysis and recalibrated model as part of its written comments , slated for submission in March 2017. (See, e.g., Slide 11 of 18 of the CDFW's January 3, 2017 presentation). Modesto Irrigation District (MID) has submitted a Public Records Act request to the CDFW to request immediate access to the recalibrated model and to any and all of the corresponding analyses that detail the errors, the fixes and a description of the impacts on the Revised SED's analyses and conclusions from use of this faulty model.	Please see Master Response 3.1, Fish Protection, regarding the benefits of the plan amendments and the use of SalSim. CDFW provided written comments on the plan amendments on March 15, 2017, which stated that the updated SJRSim model should be viewed as preliminary because the developer (AD Consultants) was not available to assist with the model refinements. In addition, the updated version has not gone through peer review. Therefore, the State Water Board has not used the new version of the model, which is now called SJRSim instead of SalSim.
1122	2	The Revised SED should not contain information which the SWRCB knows to be inaccurate, incomplete or false. Furthermore, according to the CDFW, the SWRCB will receive, and is likely to consider, the CDFW's submittal of a "corrected" SalSim model. The public must have an adequate opportunity to review and comment on the CDFW's "corrected" SalSim model and file timely comments related to the use of the "corrected" model in the analysis of potential benefits to salmon that may be expected following implementation of the Revised SED flow alternatives. It is evident that it was public comment on the original SalSim model which contributed to the CDFW's actions to search and discover specific errors in the model. To think that these errors can be so quickly "corrected" in a complex model only	See the response to Comment Letter 1122-1 regarding SalSim and the errors associated with it.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments			
Ltr#	**Cmt#**	**Comment**	**Response**
		raises further suspicions in the eyes of the public. In the interim, MID requests that the SWRCB modify the current deadline for written comment to the Revised SED until 60 days after CDFW makes the recalibrated model available to the public.	
1122	3	[ATT1: Letter to CDFW re: Public Records Act Request for data, reports, analyses, other information and related correspondence pertaining to the SalSim model and a public hearing presentation on 1/3/2017. Dated February 13, 2017.]	The commenter provided this attachment for reference purposes in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in these responses to comments; therefore, no additional response is required.
1122	4	[ATT2: Letter to CDFW re: Public Records Act Request for a corrected and recalibrated SalSim model referenced in a public hearing presentation on 1/3/2017. Dated February 14, 2017.]	The commenter provided this attachment for reference purposes in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in these responses to comments; therefore, no additional response is required.
1123	1	I am very concerned about maintaining wintertime flow of freshwater into the Delta to support the 100s of millions of birds wintering in / migrating through this incredibly important biodiversity hotspot and linchpin of the Pacific Coast Flyway.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1123	2	I am struck that you chose to have ZERO hearings in the Bay Area, forcing any of the 7 million residents here who are concerned about this to drive at least 1.5 hours each way to attend the several hearings you held in the Central Valley. This limited and skewed the voices you have heard from, towards those in the communities where you made the effort to hold hearings. Please know that many MANY thousands of us here in the immediate Bay Area would gladly show up and speak out if you provided a more accessible opportunity.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1123	3	At the start of the Dec. 20 presentation, your staff incorrectly cited the Board's 2010 report conclusion as saying 60% of natural flow was "ideal" for maintaining salmon populations. Your 2010 report stated 60% was the ABSOLUTE MINIMUM to maintain salmon populations at levels satisfying your public trust obligations. I understand further studies suggested "nonflow management strategies" (improving habitat, controlling reservoir release timing) could reduce that threshold down to 50% of natural flow, but no one on or the board nor your staff mentioned that. Nonflow strategies were referred to ad nauseum by politicians, water district panelists and others, as if those would allow salmon to survive below 30% of natural flow -- a false premise unchallenged by the board. No one on the board EVER clarified that the 30-50% of natural flow proposal ALREADY PRESUMES nonflow strategies are implemented, or that the science strongly suggests salmon extinction is inevitable even with these strategies at flows below 50%.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1123	4	Speaking of nonflow management strategies, I have compiled a list of nonwaterrelated actions that if implemented could reduce poverty, improve education & increase economic opportunities with less water withdrawn. You have no less capacity to implement these than the non-water management strategies for salmon: * Offer tax and other incentives to attract tech startups and other businesses * Fund job retraining and career enhancement programs * Provide grants and other funds for schools to secure additional funding (including support to help regional school districts win "first-come-first-served" funding through this	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments			
Ltr#	**Cmt#**	**Comment**	**Response**
		past November's Prop 51 which allocates major funding for school infrastructure).	
1123	5	You can recommend the state do more to support farming practices most efficient at providing local jobs and other local economic input per unit water withdrawal. * How much water various crops take * Impact of water demand by nonfallowable vineyards and orchards in dry years * Percent of harvests exported with no local processing or secondary markets * Jobs per acre of different crops * Off-farm employment of different crops	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1123	6	I have enormous respect and empathy for the residents of the watersheds in your Phase 1 update. But they are incorrect in attributing their woes to water, fish, you, or your draft Plan. Poverty, inequality, lack of opportunity and education, have all persisted in these communities for decades, even as they withdraw up to 90% of the natural flow from the rivers.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1123	7	Please do more to communicate the multiple benefits of restoring more flow to the San Joaquin's three main tributaries. Focusing on salmon restoration (while I support that), plays into a "fish vs. people" or "jobs vs. environment" framing. Topics that desperately need more emphasis from the Board, regarding the need for natural flow to remain in the rivers, include: * Increase groundwater recharge by more frequent/extensive natural floodplain flooding * Improve recreational use by local communities, especially low-income communities * Expand economic opportunities in recreation/tourism e.g. rafting, birding & fishing guides * Enhance water quality protection in the Delta and lower San Joaquin River.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1123	8	do more education, disseminate clearer information to people, and be quicker in correcting false statements (e.g. the repeated yet incorrect assertion that your proposal will only save 1,200 salmon). Just because people on all sides criticize you or seem angry about your decision, doesn't mean you've struck the right balance.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1124	1	Based on my field experience conducting and coordinating salmon population estimates during the 1970s and 1980s, and statistical analysis of salmon production and freshwater flows on the San Joaquin River (SJR), I found a strong positive correlation between freshwater flows on San Joaquin tributaries from February through June and returns of adult salmon spawners 2.5 years later. The reasons were that higher spring flows increased freshwater habitat for salmon juveniles, prevented lethal high water temperatures from forming in the lower tributaries and the main stem SJR, improved save passage of juvenile salmon down the tributaries and through the Delta and into SF Bay, and increased planktonic food production for salmon in the freshwater/saltwater mixing zone of the	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments			
Ltr#	**Cmt#**	**Comment**	**Response**
		estuary. Besides salmon, freshwater flows were also highly beneficial to other estuarine species that depend on the estuary for food supply and/or reproduction. Examples are Dungeness crab larvae, white and green sturgeon, steelhead, California halibut, sharks and rays, and forage species, such as threadfin shad, Pacific herring, northern anchovy, and various species of smelt and shrimp. Many fish eating birds, such as kingfishers, herons, grebes, terns, pelicans, sea gulls, and mergansers, feed on these forage fish. Adult fish are also important as food for humans and mammals that depend on them, such as river otters, sea lions, and the occasional Orca. It is critically important that this food web and nursery area be protected and improved upon with increased freshwater flows, as estuaries are one of the most productive ecological systems in the world. Without significant improvements to instream flows, implementation of non-flow measures, while beneficial, will not meet the salmon doubling objectives alone, as required by law, or adequately protect fish and wildlife beneficial uses. Best available science demonstrates that current flows are insufficient to protect public trust resources and uses within the SJR basin or the Bay Delta. Ecosystem functions can only be achieved with increased flows and a flow regime that mimics the natural hydrograph.	
1124	2	Substantial scientific evidence demonstrates that approximately 50% -60% of unimpaired flow is the minimum necessary to reestablish and sustain fish and wildlife beneficial uses. 50% is insufficient because it is the lower end of a minimum flow; therefore 60% of the unimpaired freshwater flows is needed to pass down the Stanislaus, Tuolumne, and Merced rivers to the Delta to protect and improve a reasonable level of our public trust resources. The Board has a public trust responsibility in the planning and allocation of water resources, and to protect the public trust resources whenever feasible.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1124	3	To maximize zooplankton habitat and maintain high biological production in the Estuary to support the food web, it is very important that the entrapment zone, which is the section of the salinity gradient where fresh and salt water initially mix and surface salinities are 1.2 - 6.0 parts per thousand, be positioned over the shallows of Suisun Bay during the summer months. Keeping the zone in this area would be accomplished by regulating water releases from upstream dams and water exports from the pumping plants in the South Delta	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1124	4	In addition to reductions in biological production caused by water diversions upstream from the Estuary, reduced freshwater flows allow pollutants to accumulate to dangerous levels and encourages blooms of toxic algae, reduces sediment supply to Bay Area wetlands and beaches, and makes it easier for undesirable non-native species to successfully invade and remain viable in the Bay Estuary. Increasing freshwater flows through the Estuary would at least partially mitigate these negative impacts. All entities who diver water destined for the Bay should be required to contribute their fair share of fresh water to support benefits enjoyed by all Californians. Investments in local water supplies around the state, including conservation and recycling, can generate millions of acre-feet of water and reduce reliance on water diverted from the Estuary and its watershed.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1124	5	The root cause of our current water resource problems are unsustainable human population growth approaching 40 million in California and overconsumption of a finite natural resource, i.e. water. Continued population growth (consumers) should be discouraged and reduced per capita and overall water consumption rates should be encouraged whenever	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments			
Ltr#	**Cmt#**	**Comment**	**Response**
		possible.	
1125	1	Maintaining Delta water flows for a healthy ecosystem for all - for a healthy environment, for our children.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1126	1	The Central Valleys economy is dependent on agriculture and agriculture is dependent on water. Less water equal less production. It is that simple. If this plan takes effect it will set off a chain reaction that will devastate the entire economy of the Central Valley. This amendment is not beneficial to all, and it is not a compromise. Approving this is not the right act for California, and it is definitely worth my fight.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1127	1	The State Water Board's Bay-Delta Water Plan will negatively effect my family and I. Although my mother's career involves medical billing, it will even effect her job. Because if we have to deal with unemployment, the people of the Central Valley will look elsewhere for jobs. This will cause less need for services, such as the one my mom provides.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1128	1	I am here on behalf of 400 students enrolled in my Ag department and the community I serve in Hilmar, California. Hilmar is a small unincorporated community of just over 5,000 people in North Merced County. Our main industry is production, agriculture and food processing. We also have a history of businesses that provide support for these industries. Being close to the Stanislaus county line, we re ceive irrigation water from Turlock Irrigation District (TID). If water is reduced the negative impact on our local economy will be devastating. We produce food for a living, without water this won't be possible: Loss of small businesses loss of food supply Unemployment Loss of property values	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1128	2	Have all attempts been made to save the economic situation by trying other environmental improvements aside from water flow?	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1129	1	The State Water Board's Bay Delta Plan will negatively effect me and my family. Without water we won't be able to grow crops. And if we can't feed our animals the dairies will go out of business. Then my father will lose his business because he will not have any customers to serve or do repairs for.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1130	1	The State Water Board's Bay Delta Plan will negatively effect me and my family. My Dad is a truck driver who transports produce, including chickens from the farms to the grocery stores. Without water you cannot produce the crops to feed the chickens, let alone be able to raise them. This would put my father out of a job, which would effect our income drastically.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1131	1	The State Water Board's Bay-Delta Plan will really effect my family because we grow almonds. This plan will take away all of our district water which will have a big effect on our crop and our income, also our land value.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments			
Ltr#	**Cmt#**	**Comment**	**Response**
1132	1	The State Water Board's ay - Delta Plan will negatively effect me and my family because my Mom could lose her job in the animal feed industry. Because without water we can't grow the crops needed to make pre-made feed mix to sell to dairy farmers, because they could possibly go out of business,	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1133	1	The proposing water board will bring negativity to me and my family because dairies can't function without water. My grandparents own a dairy and without water it will go out of business. Please reconsider.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1134	1	The State Water Board's Bay-Delta Plan will negatively affect me and my family because like most people who live in the country we rely on our well for our water. If our water is going to be restricted from our reservoirs. Many farmers will change to wells like some already have, then people who live in the country like me will eventually run low on well water which will cause them to drill another well which we cannot afford to do at this point and we will really be out of ground water, and a piece of land without any water is not worth a whole lot.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1135	1	This plan will effect me and my family in a negative way. If this plan goes through the valley's economy will go bad and increase prices for food, water, milk and other things. In my house there is only me and my two brothers and my mom. When this plan goes through we will not be able to afford the products effected by this plan.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1136	1	The State Water Board Bay Delta Water Plan will negatively effect me and my family because it will cause a great amount of jobs to be lost, including mine. Without water we won't be able to grow crops for our animals. It will increase the cost of feed and people will have to give up their businesses. Our community revolves around farms and dairie; without them our community will be nothing. It could also effect my dream of becoming a diesel mechanic. Because if there are no crops to be hauled around, there will be no trucks on the road. And if there's no trucks then nothing will need to be fixed. Then there will be more jobs lost.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1137	1	Why send water downstream instead of giving farmers water to farm? If farmers lose water they will shut down and leave. That will leave people unemployed. I am 16 years old and live in a family of five. If dairies shut down I won't be able to get a job in my area. My grandpa will lose his job driving silage trucks for a dairy. Milk and cheese prices will rise and many other California grown foods.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1137	2	I believe this plan is to benefit people in the LA area and not so much the fish. The plan does not help all people but only the ones who get the water from the river for the delta to be sent to LA.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1138	1	Restricting more water for the Central Valley will cause businesses to close down.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1139	1	Why sacrifice hundreds of families and jobs just to bring back fish?	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1140	1	Our rivers and Bay Delta need higher freshwater flows. Please adopt 60% of unimpaired.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments			
Ltr#	**Cmt#**	**Comment**	**Response**
			comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1141	1	Conflicts over water use can be mitigated by developing sources of "New water" from deep saline aquifers. Associated dissolved gas in the saline aquifers will provide energy for relatively low cost desalination. Annual renewable resource is on the order of 320000 acre-feet.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1143	1	We would like to see at least 50% established and 60% when possible. Because there is limited water we need to catch more seasonal runoff in new reservoirs asap. Much winter runoff is now lost.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1144	1	I support more water for fisheries.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1145	1	Increased Delta flow protect the productive capacity of the Bay Estuary system.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1146	1	We are a non-profit advocacy organization intervening in public processes planning for use of public resources, when public agencies with trust responsibilities choose not to fully protect public rights. This Board has recognized more claims on public water than there is water in the system. We support the Board in exercising reasonable supervision on Trust Resources to protect the trust whenever reasonable. The proposed increases in flows are moving toward the realization of this long established public duty. Our main concern is that a commitment to reasonableness should be investigated and analyzed throughout the process.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1146	2	The starting point of requiring 40% of unimpaired flows seems a minimal rational commitment.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1147	1	I am here today to share my concerns about the devastation the Bay Delta SED plan will have on recreational trout fishing throughout California. The water used for Calaveras Trout Farm is derived from the same pool as Merced Irrigation District's water diversion. During the 48 years that Calaveras has been in operation, we have only had to shut down once. As a result of the severe prolonged drought, we had to temporarily close down our operation from April 2015 to October 2016 for a total of 18 months. The cause of this closure was the warm water that flowed from Lake McClure when it fell to a historic low of 6% capacity. This in turn caused the Merced River, near Snelling, to experience higher water temperatures. Trout, which are members of the Salmonidae family, is a cold-water fish that can't survive high water temperatures. I can tell you from experience that MID's water operations on the Merced River are advantageous for anadromous fish and water temperatures. MID's summer water diversions provide adequate cold water for anadromous fish to survive and thrive just like the trout of Calaveras Fish Farm have for 47 out of 48 years.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments			
Ltr#	**Cmt#**	**Comment**	**Response**
		I'm concerned that if the state takes even 30% of the water from Lake McClure that you are going to create drought conditions annually. If this is the case, Calaveras Trout Farm will be put out of business permanently, harming trout anglers across the entire state. During our recent closure, many of our customers had to either shut down or pay extremely high prices for fish purchased out of state. They were paying $7 per pound- and could only purchase the trout if they bought 7,000-pound loads. Many of our customers were priced out and simply couldn't afford to purchase fish. Unfortunately, I have been told there is no mention in the SED of the potential loss of the trout farm because of the chronic lowering of Lake McClure water elevation. While there will always speculations in regards to the SED impact on fishery and recreation, we know for a f act that the State and California and those who love to fish for trout will definitely lose 350,000 trout annually, along with their recreational benefits. No analysis looked at the balloon effect for recreationists as far as Indio [sic] and all promoted activities as a result of lack in fish stocking. Comparing that to a not guaranteed 1,100 fish is worth looking at.	
1147	2	I have been on the Merced River and watched its operation for decades: its operations are advantageous to both salmon and trout. I urge you to listen to the locals, like myself and MID, who have the on-the-ground knowledge of the Merced River. In the most simple terms: your proposed changes to the operation of Lake McClure will deplete the stored water pool that is advantageous for fish. In our region, fish and fanner are both living in harmony on the Merced River. There is no need to drastically change a system that has multiple benefits under its current operation. If the SED goal is truly about salmon, my recommendation- with years of experience raising fish on the Merced River- is to keep the District water flowing and keep the reservoir healthy for all. Merced Irrigation District has done an excellent job over the last 100 years. For the sake of trout anglers across the state; for the sake of my business; for the sake of our local economy; and for the sake of the agriculture that feeds our state and our nation, I respectfully urge you to listen to MID and to rely on their expertise. For the benefit of all, please give full consideration to the District's proposed Merced River S.A.F.E. Plan. Allow MID to do what they do best: manage Lake McClure with multiple benefits for fish, farmer and water quality alike.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1148	1	Our District [East Merced Resource Conservation District] is dependent upon water from the Merced River. This water irrigates the crops of our large agriculture economy, recharges our groundwater aquifer, and provides water for our communities. It is our only source of water. We are not connected to the Central Valley Project or the California Aqueduct. Once diverted, our water cannot be replenished and will result in a shrinking agricultural economy, loss of jobs, declining revenue for schools and social services, and an unsustainable groundwater overdraft. Taking a holistic approach to natural resource management requires assessing the social and economic impact of water diversions from the Merced River.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1148	2	Our District [East Merced Resource Conservation District] is in the process of obtaining a programmatic permit for ecosystem restoration along the entire 55-mile reach of the Lower Merced River. This permit will allow us to remove invasive plants such as Arundo donax,	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments			
Ltr#	**Cmt#**	**Comment**	**Response**
		create riparian buffer zones of native vegetation to reduce nutrient runoff, and perform river cleanup projects. These actions will greatly improve habitat for salmon and ecosystem health. Although important, water flows are only one element to consider in creating an ecosystem suitable for salmon. A holistic approach requires that ecosystem complexities be understood, and efforts be made to address each factor that contributes to a healthy ecosystem.	
1148	3	Our District [East Merced Resource Conservation District] supports the Merced Irrigation District's S.A.F.E. river plan. This plan will create and maintain a balance between local human needs (urban, agriculture, recreational, etc.) and a healthy salmon fishery. This plan will: - Increase Merced river flows at critical times during the year to benefit salmon. - Improve salmon habitat by restoring and enhancing 5.5 miles of river habitat by planting riparian vegetation, stabilizing river banks, and placing spawning gravel in the river. - Modernize and expand the Merced River Salmon Hatchery to provide increased fish stocks. - Reduce salmon predation by removing non-native bass from the river and creating salmon friendly habitat. This plan is holistic and balances the water resource needs of agriculture, communities and the environment and will create a sustainable salmon fishery. We recommend that the board rescind the SED issued in September of 2016 and adopt a holistic plan like that proposed by the Merced Irrigation District.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1149	1	The Manteca City Council hereby respectfully submit s the attached Resolution Opposing the State Water Resources Control Board 2016 Revised Draft Substitute Environmental Document and Calling for Sustainable Solutions for the Stanislaus River and the Region's Economy [See ATT:1].	The City Ordinance begins by summarizing the Bay-Delta Plan Update process and timeline, but does not make a general comment regarding the plan amendments or raise significant environmental issues. Master Response 1.1, General Comments, addresses comments in general opposition to the plan amendments as well as general comments on socioeconomics and general comments on agriculture, groundwater, hydropower, native fish, and drinking water.
1149	2	Flows described in the SED will create "significant and unavoidable" lasting impacts that will harm the socioeconomic welfare of those within Stanislaus, Merced, and San Joaquin counties, which encompasses the City of Manteca. Water supply impacts of flows described in the SED include the loss of hundreds of thousands of acre-feet of surface water that is used to keep agriculture the region's economic engine--stable. This loss of water would result in the fallowing of some of the most prime farmland in California.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that do not raise significant environmental issues or make a general comment regarding the plan amendments and general information regarding the economic analysis.
1149	3	The Manteca City Council strongly encourages the SWRCB to pursue a comprehensive solution, which takes into account, rather than dismisses, the impacts listed in the City's Resolution [see ATT:1]. This solution must prioritize non-flow measures to protect native fish species, such as predation reduction programs, before requiring flow increases that would threaten the economic vitality of our region's counties, cities, and small family farms.	The State Water Board recognizes the importance of implementing non-flow measures to aid in the recovery of, and to support, salmon populations. Please refer to Master Response 5.2, Incorporation of Non-Flow Measures regarding the role of non-flow measures in the plan amendments. Non-flow actions are recommended as part of a comprehensive effort to address Delta aquatic ecosystem needs, as set forth in Appendix K, Revised Water Quality Control Plan. For a discussion regarding the need for improved flow in protecting fish and wildlife, consideration of fish predation, and the approach of unimpaired flow as functional flow, please see Master Response 3.1, Fish Protection. For a discussion on State Water Board's authority related to non-flow measures and the incorporation of

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments			
Ltr#	**Cmt#**	**Comment**	**Response**
			non-flow measures in the plan amendments, please see Master Response 5.2, Incorporation of Non-Flow Measures.
1149	4	The City of Manteca thank you in advance for your consideration of the City's very serious concerns regarding the loss of flows to our South County Water Supply Program.	This comment does not make a general comment on the plan amendments or raise a significant environmental issue. No further response is required.
1149	5	ATT:1: RESOLUTION R2016-227 RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MANTECA OPPOSING THE STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD 2016 REVISED DRAFT SUBSTITUTE ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT AND CALLING FOR SUSTAINABLE SOLUTIONS FOR THE STANISLAUS RIVER AND THE REGION'S ECONOMY	The commenter provided this attachment for reference purposes in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in these responses to comments; therefore, no additional response is required.
1149	6	RESOLUTION R2016-227 RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MANTECA OPPOSING THE STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD 2016 REVISED DRAFT SUBSTITUTE ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT AND CALLING FOR SUSTAINABLE SOLUTIONS FOR THE STANISLAUS RIVER AND THE REGION'S ECONOMY WHEREAS, the City of Manteca, along with its partner agency, the South San Joaquin Irrigation District (SSJID), utilize certain water rights on the Stanislaus River including pre-1914 appropriative rights to divert water and various post-1914 appropriative rights to store water from the Stanislaus River in various reservoirs I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing Resolution was duly adopted by the City Council of the City of Manteca at a public meeting of said City Council held on the 15th day of November 2016	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that do not raise significant environmental issues or make a general comment regarding the plan amendments. A discussion of existing water rights and surface water conditions is provided in Chapter 5, Surface Hydrology and Water Quality, and includes discussion of South San Joaquin Irrigation District's (SSJID) water rights. The commenter's statements do not conflict with information presented in the SED. No further response is required.
1149	7	RESOLUTION R2016-227 RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MANTECA OPPOSING THE STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD 2016 REVISED DRAFT SUBSTITUTE ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT AND CALLING FOR SUSTAINABLE SOLUTIONS FOR THE STANISLAUS RIVER AND THE REGION'S ECONOMY WHEREAS, the South San Joaquin Irrigation District has successfully delivered surface water to the region of Southern San Joaquin County for over 107 years, providing the area with a high-quality, reliable surface water supply that has contributed to the economic vitality and strength of the local economy I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing Resolution was duly adopted by the City Council of the City of Manteca at a public meeting of said City Council held on the 15th day of November 2016	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, acknowledging the concerns of elected representatives and other community members and for responses to comments that either make a general comment regarding the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1149	8	RESOLUTION R2016-227 RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MANTECA OPPOSING THE STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD 2016 REVISED DRAFT SUBSTITUTE ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT AND CALLING FOR SUSTAINABLE SOLUTIONS FOR THE STANISLAUS RIVER AND THE REGION'S ECONOMY	The commenter has provided a copy of a resolution of opposition to the 2016 SED adopted by the City Council of Manteca. Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that do not raise significant environmental issues or make a general comment regarding plan amendments.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments			
Ltr#	**Cmt#**	**Comment**	**Response**
		WHEREAS, in 1995, the Cities of Escalon, Lathrop, Manteca, and Tracy carne together with the District to develop the South County Water Supply Project, culminating in the construction and operation of the Nick C. DeGroot Water Treatment Plant and the delivery of treated surface water to the region's residents I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing Resolution was duly adopted by the City Council of the City of Manteca at a public meeting of said City Council held on the 15th day of November 2016	
1149	9	RESOLUTION R2016-227 RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MANTECA OPPOSING THE STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD 2016 REVISED DRAFT SUBSTITUTE ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT AND CALLING FOR SUSTAINABLE SOLUTIONS FOR THE STANISLAUS RIVER AND THE REGION'S ECONOMY WHEREAS, the State Water Resources Control Board's (SWRCB's) Bay-Delta Plan, Phase 1 Draft Substitute Environmental Document (SED) issued in December 2012 proposed to require the Stanislaus, Tuolumne, and Merced rivers release 35 percent of unimpaired flows from February to June each year for environmental benefit; and WHEREAS, a revised Draft SED was issued on September 15, 2016, and is currently being circulated for public comment; and WHEREAS, the SWRCB, after a hearing in March 2013 and submittal of comments regarding the adequacy and sustainability of the SED, has now revised and increased the recommendations of the Draft SED to 40% unimpaired flows, with the ultimate intention of finalizing the SED and updating the Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan with its Board for adoption at a date to be determined I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing Resolution was duly adopted by the City Council of the City of Manteca at a public meeting of said City Council held on the 15th day of November 2016	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment regarding the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1149	10	RESOLUTION R2016-227 RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MANTECA OPPOSING THE STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD 2016 REVISED DRAFT SUBSTITUTE ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT AND CALLING FOR SUSTAINABLE SOLUTIONS FOR THE STANISLAUS RIVER AND THE REGION'S ECONOMY WHEREAS, flows described in the SED will create "significant and unavoidable" lasting impacts that will harm the socioeconomic welfare of those within Stanislaus, San Joaquin and Merced counties; and WHEREAS, water supply impacts of flows described in the SED include the loss of hundreds of thousands of acre-feet of surface water that is used to keep agriculture--the region's economic engine--stable. This loss of water would result in the fallowing of some of the most prime farmland in California I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing Resolution was duly adopted by the City Council of the City of Manteca at a public meeting of said City Council held on the 15th day of November	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that do not raise significant environmental issues or make a general comment regarding the plan amendments and general information regarding the economic analysis.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments			
Ltr#	**Cmt#**	**Comment**	**Response**
		2016	
1149	11	RESOLUTION R2016-227 RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MANTECA OPPOSING THE STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD 2016 REVISED DRAFT SUBSTITUTE ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT AND·CALLING FOR SUSTAINABLE SOLUTIONS FOR THE STANISLAUS RIVER AND THE REGION'S ECONOMY WHEREAS, groundwater impacts of flows described in the SED include increased groundwater pumping at a time when California is working to implement the landmark Sustainable Groundwater Management Act. The SED estimates additional and significant groundwater reliance in the local East San Joaquin groundwater sub-basin, a basin that is already identified as critically overdrafted in San Joaquin County. The reduced surface water deliveries proposed in the SED will severely hamper the ability to conjunctively use surface water deliveries on farms to provide adequate groundwater recharge I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing Resolution was duly adopted by the City Council of the City of Manteca at a public meeting of said City Council held on the 15th day of November 2016	The plan amendments and SED do not require or encourage increased groundwater pumping to offset the reduction in surface water. The SED merely reflects the historical local response to increase groundwater pumping when surface water availability is reduced. It will be up to local entities to determine the precise actions that would be taken in response to the implementation of the plan amendments, with or without the future condition of SGMA. The plan amendments do not limit the abilities of local entities to comply with SGMA; comprehensively addressing both surface water and groundwater resources allows for integrated planning of scarce water resources that does not trade impacts between surface and groundwater. For discussions on overdraft as a legacy condition and compliance with SGMA in the context of the plan amendments, please see Master Response 3.4, Groundwater Resources and the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act, for a discussion
1149	12	RESOLUTION R2016-227 RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MANTECA OPPOSING THE STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD 2016 REVISED DRAFT SUBSTITUTE ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT AND·CALLING FOR SUSTAINABLE SOLUTIONS FOR THE STANISLAUS RIVER AND THE REGION'S ECONOMY WHEREAS, power impacts of flows described in the SED include public power agencies being resigned to generating more hydropower at a time of low demand, meaning less water is available to generate hydropower in summer when power demand is at its peak. This has economic impacts to public power agencies, and such impacts bear a direct relation to local customer utility rates I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing Resolution was duly adopted by the City Council of the City of Manteca at a public meeting of said City Council held on the 15th day of November 2016	Potential effects of increased hydropower generation in the spring and reduced hydropower generation in the summer are discussed in Master Response 3.2, Surface Water Analyses and Modeling, as well as in Chapter 14, Energy and Greenhouse Gases, and Appendix J, Hydropower and Electric Grid Analysis of Lower San Joaquin River Flow Alternatives. The potential economic considerations associated with hydropower are considered in Chapter 20, Economic Analysis, and Master Response 8.4, Non-Agricultural Economic Considerations, which discuss the seasonal variation and effects on economic revenues.
1149	13	RESOLUTION R2016-227 RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MANTECA OPPOSING THE STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD 2016 REVISED DRAFT SUBSTITUTE ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT AND·CALLING FOR SUSTAINABLE SOLUTIONS FOR THE STANISLAUS RIVER AND THE REGION'S ECONOMY WHEREAS, there is reasonable and significant doubt that the flows described in the SED will benefit native fish populations or promote ecosystem restoration. I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing Resolution was duly adopted by the City Council of the City of Manteca at a public meeting of said City Council held on the 15th day of November 2016	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment regarding the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues. The State Water Board has strived to use the best available science throughout the scientific basis and benefits analyses, consistent with the requirements of the certified regulatory planning process, and, in accordance with CEQA, used its best efforts to find out and disclose what it reasonably can. Additionally, the official public review process for the plan amendments provides an opportunity for formal public comment on the plan amendments. Public and agency comments on the 2012 draft SED led to further refinement of the plan amendments, as evidenced in the current document. Appendix C, Chapter 19, and Chapter 7 of the plan amendments provide substantial and significant information regarding the benefits to native fish populations from the proposed project.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments			
Ltr#	**Cmt#**	**Comment**	**Response**
			Please see Master Response 3.1, Fish Protection, regarding the expected benefits of the plan amendments.
1149	14	RESOLUTION R2016-227 RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MANTECA OPPOSING THE STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD 2016 REVISED DRAFT SUBSTITUTE ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT AND·CALLING FOR SUSTAINABLE SOLUTIONS FOR THE STANISLAUS RIVER AND THE REGION'S ECONOMY The SED focuses narrowly on flows as a solution to environmental concerns while ignoring non-flow alternatives such as predator suppression and fish habitat restoration. Such non-flow management measures are often less costly and more effective I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing Resolution was duly adopted by the City Council of the City of Manteca at a public meeting of said City Council held on the 15th day of November 2016	The State Water Board acknowledges that uncertainty is inherent in any programmatic planning effort of this geographic and temporal scale. Moreover, foreseeing the unforeseeable is not possible. The State Water Board, however, has strived to use the best available science throughout the scientific basis and benefits analyses, consistent with the requirements of the certified regulatory planning process, and, in accordance with CEQA, used its best efforts to find out and disclose what it reasonably can. Additionally, the official public review process for the plan amendments provides an opportunity for formal public comment on the plan amendments. Public and agency comments on the 2012 draft SED led to further refinement of the plan amendments, as evidenced in the current document. Please see Master Response 3.1, Fish Protection, regarding the expected benefits of the proposed project on fish resources.
1149	15	RESOLUTION R2016-227 RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MANTECA OPPOSING THE STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD 2016 REVISED DRAFT SUBSTITUTE ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT AND·CALLING FOR SUSTAINABLE SOLUTIONS FOR THE STANISLAUS RIVER AND THE REGION'S ECONOMY WHEREAS, the cities of Escalon, Lathrop, Manteca, and Tracy within San Joaquin County have made significant investments in diversifying their drinking water sources to include the use of water from the Stanislaus River. With the implementation of the SED, the use of river water for drinking water is threatened, leaving local communities even more vulnerable to the impacts of drought and potentially stranding significant investments in these vital assets. I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing Resolution was duly adopted by the City Council of the City of Manteca at a public meeting of said City Council held on the 15th day of November 2016	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for general comments on the plan amendments and a discussion of common issues and concerns raised by commenters. Please see Master Response 8.4, Non-Agricultural Economic Considerations, regarding stranded capital costs, and potential costs to municipalities in the plan area.
1149	16	RESOLUTION R2016-227 RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MANTECA OPPOSING THE STATE WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD 2016 REVISED DRAFT SUBSTITUTE ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT AND·CALLING FOR SUSTAINABLE SOLUTIONS FOR THE STANISLAUS RIVER AND THE REGION'S ECONOMY NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED AND ORDERED, the State Water Resources Control Board should pursue a comprehensive solution, which takes into account, rather than dismisses, the impacts to the City of Manteca. This solution must prioritize non-flow measures to protect native fish species, such as predation reduction programs, before requiring flow increases that would threaten the economic vitality of our region's counties, cities and small family farms. I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing Resolution was duly adopted by the City Council of the City of Manteca at a public meeting of said City Council held on the 15th day of November	Please see response to Comment 1149-14.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments			
Ltr#	**Cmt#**	**Comment**	**Response**
		2016	
1150	1	As proposed, the Bay Delta WQCP SED would have tremendous economic impacts on our community. If approved, your proposal requiring the Merced, Tuolumne, and Stanislaus rivers to dedicate 40 percent of unimpaired flow to be diverted away from our communities and toward the Bay Delta would cause Irreversible harm to our region. This is particularly true of our economy and local water quality.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1150	2	Depleting the Lake McClure reservoir with your "40 percent unimpaired flow" regime is unimaginable. Yet that is exactly what is being proposed with this plan. This water diversion will directly harm our local efforts to comply with the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA). The Bay Delta SED plan would cause direct groundwater reductions in our region, making it nearly impossible to achieve the state-mandated sustainability.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1150	3	With the implementation of this measure, Hilltop Ranch would be forced to reduce its worldforce as a result of 20 percent of existing farmland being taken out of production. This would significantly impact the lives of the families that we employ, as well as the local economy.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1150	4	Before your board votes to harm our agricultural economy, our drinking water and community, please work with the local water districts (many of whom have peer-reviewed, most recent science) to look at non-flow measures that can accomplish realistic goals for the environment and the Bay-Delta before considering a flow-centric approach.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1151	1	Our Merced Soccer Academy players come from all kinds of families with parents that are fire fighters, teachers, and lawyers; but the highest percent of our players come from families whose parents work in factories or are field workers. The majority of our kids live on what would be considered the "other side of the tracks" and from low-income families. The fact is all of our youth are at a disadvantage. Their community is overrun with gangs, drugs and crime. There are few jobs. This is their daily reality. From my view, our entire community is on the wrong side of the tracks. There is nowhere to go. Our kids must live with these negative influences in their lives. So now, because of your decision of cutting our water supply, what does that say about their future?.... you tell me.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1151	2	The Merced Soccer Academy has many players graduating from universities as doctors, teachers, lawyers and small business owners. For the first time in our organization one of our soccer players, Alfonso Ocampo- who is only 14 years old from the community of Winton, a gang infested community, moved to Seattle, Washington to play for the Seattle Sanders, a professional major soccer league. Through our efforts he is just one of many success stories: he is now ranked number 3 in the U.S. Soccer Federation and you can go to USSoccer.com to verify. But with your decision all this can come to a quick end. It is like we take one step forward and then three steps back. We are having to fight for everything. Now these kids who receive these messages of that- you can't go to college, you can't get a job, you're better off selling drugs - they are being told by the state government: you can't have good quality water in Merced. Why? Because we are poor? Because we don't count? Because we are on the "wrong side of the tracks" in California? I want you to explain - why?	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments			
Ltr#	**Cmt#**	**Comment**	**Response**
1151	3	I am hoping that with these over 700 signatures it brings an awareness to you of our concern. You, as the decision makers, when I go back to my community, tell me how I'm going to explain to my community, who is losing hundreds of trees, where some of our parks have become just dirt, our gardens have dried out because we don't have enough water, tell me how I'm going to explain that you want to take even more water from our community than what you are already taking.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1152	1	The subject of this hearing is consideration of a 40% unimpaired springtime flows in the San Joaquin River. There is a problem in drawing conclusions on the San Joaquin because flows are currently very low plus we do not have as much science data there that can demonstrate the benefits of flow increases in that river. On the Sacramento River, we have a great deal of flow and science data which I will refer to. I believe it is safe to say that conclusions on flow changes in the Sacramento, will equally apply on the San Joaquin.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment regarding the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues. Please also refer to Master Response 3.1, Fish Protection, regarding the expected benefits of the proposed project. Please also see Appendix C, Technical Report on the Scientific for Alternative San Joaquin River Flow and Southern Delta Salinity Objectives, and Chapter 19, Analyses of Benefits to Native Fish Populations from Increased Flow between February 1 and June 30, which provide additional information regarding the scientific basis of the plan amendments.
1152	2	How have Sacramento and San Joaquin flow decreases impacted my Pro-Troll business? The first chart below [see ATT 1] shows a macro view of how the salmon populations decreased as water exports increased. Between 2004 and 2008 there were no export pumping restrictions. As pumping increased, the flows needed for the salmon decreased. That, and a year or so of poor ocean conditions seriously decreased the salmon survival as the chart shows. For the most part, the salmon populations have never recovered to a reasonable level.	Please see Chapter 20, Economic Analyses, for a discussion on the effects on fisheries and associated regional economies Section 20.3.5 regarding effects on Fisheries and Associated Regional Economies. Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment regarding the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1152	3	[ATT 1: Graph: Delta Exports, Salmon Returns]	The commenter is providing this attachment for reference purposes in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in these responses to comments; therefore, no additional response is required.
1152	4	The next chart [see ATT 2] shows the percentage of my total Pro-Troll annual sales that have come from California for the last several years. In 2003, 23% of my sales were in California. Things were good. But, the line then went steadily down until it hit the 2008 and 2009 period when the entire salmon industry was shut down to avoid a total loss of the runs. The key message in this chart [ATT 2] is what happened in 2011, 2012 and 2013. Starting in 2010, the Sacramento flows began increasing and by 2011 the flows from the Keswick Dam were up 300% in the March and April two-month period. The 2011 daily average was 16,556 cubic feet per second in those two months. This was right when the fall-run fish were starting their downstream migration. The heavy flows pushed the juveniles down the river through the Delta and into the ocean. All the other conditions were basically the same. By 2013 when those juveniles matured in the ocean, the salmon harvest set a modern record. My sales reflected it and increased to 10.3% in California. This represents a clear correlation between flows and salmon business income. Note that between 2008 and 2011, Pro-Troll lost money every year and by 20 15 only 2.8% of our business remained in California. We are not alone. California salmon businesses across the board are suffering badly.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment regarding the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues. The commenter's reference to the effects on the salmon fishing industry is generally consistent with the information presented in Chapter 20, Economic Analyses, regarding the reduction in salmon populations and the resulting crash of the fishing industry (Section 20.3.5, Effects on Fisheries and Associated Regional Economies).
1152	5	[ATT 2: Graph: Pro-Toll % of Tackle Sold in California 2003-2015]	The commenter is providing this attachment for reference purposes in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in these responses to comments; therefore, no additional response is required.
1152	6	The chart [see ATT 3] shows the dramatic change in Keswick flows that occurred in March and April of 2011. The river was at or near flood stage and the fall-run juvenile salmon were the big beneficiaries in getting a safe ride to the ocean. The chart also shows that when the March and April flows are below 4,000 CFS, the natural spawning wild fish are in trouble.	The commenter notes that improved flows and habitat improvement, including predation projects, will improve the survival of fall-run juvenile salmon. The commenter does not make a general comment regarding the plan amendments or raise significant environmental issues.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments			
Ltr#	**Cmt#**	**Comment**	**Response**
		This has been taking place in recent years. Note that the word currently is underlined. Better flows will obviously help but there are also a number of habitat improvement and predation projects that can help improve survival. The fish agencies, the Bureau and the stakeholders are all working hard to get more of these habitat projects funded and approved for construction. Unfortunately, several of them remain stalled.	
1152	7	We [Pro-Troll Fishing] would point out that heavy sustained high flows are not necessarily the full answer. In some cases a well-timed pulse of a few days duration may do an adequate job of moving the juveniles downstream. The fall-run returns to the San Joaquin River also set a recent record in 2013 because of the increased flows in 20 11 and the restricted pumping that started in 2010.	Please see Master Response 3.1, Protection of Fish and Wildlife, for information about the unimpaired flow approach, a discussion of flow, and how differing flows will be beneficial for Chinook salmon.
1152	8	[ATT 3: Graph: Average Keswick Release Flows. March and April 2007-2016]	The commenter is providing this attachment for reference purposes in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in these responses to comments; therefore, no additional response is required.
1152	9	[ATT 4: Table: The Fall-run returns to the San Joaquin River]	The commenter is providing this attachment for reference purposes in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in these responses to comments; therefore, no additional response is required.
1152	10	The salmon industry, many thousands of fishermen and we believe the California public, strongly support the water board adopting increased flows. If we are to avoid more serious salmon declines and even potential extinctions, increased flows need to be one of the actions taken.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that do not raise significant environmental issues or make a general comment regarding the plan amendments.
1152	11	The salmon runs and the salmon industry are both currently in deep trouble. The commercial industry collapsed in 2015. There were not enough fish in the ocean to support them. Many of them had to sell their boats to avoid bankruptcy. Many of their families have also had to visit food lines. The coastal communities from Morro Bay to Crescent City are dying with them. Marinas, service centers, retail stores, motels and restaurants all depend on the salmon fishermen for income. We are now approaching the conditions that prevailed in 2008 and 2009 when the entire industry was shut down. At that time, there were 906 retail outlets selling salmon equipment. It is estimated that we lost at least 100 of them. We also lost a big share of the boating industry. Seventy percent of the boats sold are used for fishing. The following chart [see ATT 5] shows some of the larger businesses that failed during the shutdown. There were also a lot of smaller ones that are not shown. In 2008 and 2009 Governor Schwarzenegger declared a salmon fishing disaster and the commercial fishermen received federal compensation. Today, they are receiving no compensation. When the industry is operating, it supports 23,000 jobs and generates $1.4 billion in economic benefits for the state. When the abundance is adequate, approximately 500,000 California residents fish for salmon annually. Recently, thirty nine prominent chefs and restaurant owners in the Bay Area wrote a letter supporting the protection of the California salmon runs. Several of them said salmon was the top choice on their menu. This is strong evidence of public support. These things represent an important beneficial public use of water and it needs the protection of the Water Board.	Please see response to comment 1152-4 regarding commercial fishing industry economic-related effects.
1152	12	[ATT 5: Major Fishing and Marine Failures in 2008 and 2009]	The commenter provided this attachment for reference purposes in support of their comments. Those

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments			
Ltr#	**Cmt#**	**Comment**	**Response**
			comments are addressed in these responses to comments; therefore, no additional response is required.
1152	13	The next two charts [see ATT 6 and ATT 7] show the current status of the salmon industry and the serious risk we face if changes are not made to improve survival. The first chart shows a plot of the past and short term future of the ocean abundance of the fall-run salmon. Ocean abundance is the total number of surviving adult salmon that are in the ocean each year. It is calculated by adding the number of fish that are harvested to the number that return to the Central Valley to spawn. In 2002, there were 1,462,000 adult fall-run salmon in the ocean. By 2009 there were only 43,778. The winter of 2010-2011 was very wet and three years later the ocean abundance hit a modern peak of 899,503 adults. You can then see the red zone where there are not enough fish in the ocean to sustain the industry. The outlook is currently bad and it is likely getting worse in the near term future. It takes a minimum of approximately 400,000 adult salmon in the ocean to have an economically viable commercial salmon industry. At the minimum of 400,000, the industry would harvest about 50% of the fish or 200,000 and the remaining 200,000 would return to spawn. If the total Chinook returns get below the range of 121,000 to 180,000 fish, the government curtails the fishery to avoid putting the runs at extinction risk. The chart shows that starting in 2015 the fall-run was below minimums. The commercial industry was curtailed by the government and besides that, the ocean was so void of fish that most commercial fishermen could not find enough of them to even pay their expenses. Both 2015 and 2016 were disastrous for the commercial industry. Unfortunately, the blue line suggests there is no improvement in the short term future.	Please see response to comment 1152-4 regarding commercial fishing industry economic-related effects.
1152	14	[ATT 6: Graph of Central Valley Fall-run Ocean Abundance 2000-2018]	The commenter is providing this attachment for reference purposes in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in these responses to comments; therefore, no additional response is required.
1152	15	In 2015, Water4Fish developed a model to forecast the impact of the drought from 2015 on. The fish agencies assisted by providing data on returning adults, water temperatures, flows and screw trap counts of the out-migrating juveniles. The results are shown on the blue line [see ATT 6] and they are grim. Most of the spawning areas during the drought had high water temperatures which were lethal to the incubating eggs. As a result, very few juvenile salmon made it to the ocean and the adult forecast 3 years later is below the minimum threshold. In 2015, the Water4Fish model forecast an abundance of 294,000 fish which was very close to the actual count of 288,000 recorded at the end of the year. That provides some degree of confidence in the model. The chart shows the original government 2015 forecast was 652,000 fish which missed the mark badly. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the Bureau of Reclamation and the stakeholders are working on a comprehensive new model which will improve the forecasts into the future.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Responses for responses to comments that do not raise significant environmental issues associated with the analysis contained within the SED or request a modification to the plan amendments.
1152	16	The last chart [see ATT 7] shows the impact of the problems of the current water delivery system and the drought on the natural spawning fall-run fish. The data shows a serious problem. During the drought, the severe upriver temperature and flow problems primarily impacted the natural spawning fish. Most of the hatcheries either had cold water sources or chillers on site. The chart shows the result. In 2015, there were only 73,123 natural spawning adults that returned to the Sacramento River. The model suggests that this problem is only going to get worse as the impacts from the 2013, 2014 and 2015 droughts take their toll on the adults 3 years later in 2016, 2017 and 2018. This is the most serious	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment regarding the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments			
Ltr#	**Cmt#**	**Comment**	**Response**
		problem of all. At these low levels, more drought, poor ocean conditions or something like a disease breakout could wipe out the entire population. There is no margin for error left. This is probably the most overpowering reason of all why the board should consider increased spring flows.	
1152	17	Increased flows would help considerably but we also need to break the business as usual attitude that is stalling dozens of habitat and predation projects in both the Sacramento and San Joaquin watersheds. Should this run become ESA listed, every water user in the state will be severely impacted. We can avoid this but the time for action is now.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for responses to comments that either make a general comment regarding the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues. Please see Master Response 1.1 for responses to comments that generally support the plan amendments, a specific percent of unimpaired flow, or an LSJR alternative. Please see Master Response 5.2, Incorporation of Non-Flow Measures, for information regarding habitat and predation projects.
1152	18	[ATT 7: Graph showing Natural Spawning Adult Fall-run Salmon Returns 2000-2018]	The commenter is providing this attachment for reference purposes in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in these responses to comments; therefore, no additional response is required.
1152	19	Increased San Joaquin springtime flows would provide a very large benefit to the survival of its salmon. The flows would also help move the Sacramento fish through the Delta and into the Bay. There are two other elements that must parallel the increased flows.	Please see Master Response 3.1, Fish Protection, regarding the scientific basis and benefits of the proposed project, and the topic of predation. The cross channel gates are outside of the scope of this plan amendments. The operation of the cross channel gates will be considered in the Sacramento Bay-Delta watershed update.
1152	20	Reductions in the direct and indirect entrainment and predation losses at the pumps and in the salvage system are absolutely necessary. The survival of San Joaquin salmon past the pumps and through the Delta is currently only 2 to 5 percent. In addition, the cross channel gates need to be closed in the month of October or a barrier needs to be put in place to stop the 50 to 75 percent straying of the returning San Joaquin adult fish through the cross channel gates and into the Sacramento River.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Responses for responses to comments that do not raise significant environmental issues associated with the analysis contained within the SED or request a modification to the plan amendments. Please note that Chapter 7, Aquatic and Biological Resources, discusses changes in predation risk and fish entrainment risk resulting from changes in San Joaquin River inflows and export pumping.
1153	1	Salmon are the heart of the recreational salmon business, as well as the commercial fllet. Our clientele love the salmon fishery and everybody knows the valuable healthy product it is for their personal health and consumption. Our business is directly effected by seasonal, catches and our fleet in many instances totally depends on a salmon fishery resource to provide for a successful season and business. In regards to my business, the statement I made on behalf of the Golden Gate Fishermen's Association (GGFA) certainly applies to the participation of my customers regarding the salmon abundance, salmon catches and their decisions on going fishing. I believe that it applies to all of our membership. In most cases they are family businesses and their dependence on the salmon fishery provides most of their livelihood.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1153	2	I urge an adequate flow of water for the needs of salmon in the San Joaquin system as recommended by salmon scientists.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1153	3	ATT:1 Golden Gate Fishermen's Association Commercial Passenger Fleet	The commenter provided this attachment for reference purposes in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in these responses to comments; therefore, no additional response is required.
1153	4	[Att:2 - Major Fishing and Marine Failures in 2008 and 2009]	This attachment was included with the comment letter. The attachment does not make a general comment regarding the plan amendments or raise a significant environmental issue.
1153	5	[ATT:3 Commercial and Sport Catch Data- Taken from Pacific Fishery Management Council	This attachment was included with the comment letter. The attachment does not make a general comment

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments			
Ltr#	**Cmt#**	**Comment**	**Response**
		and California Fish & Wildlife Records]	regarding the plan amendments or raise a significant environmental issue.
1153	6	[ATT:4 Table of Central Valley Selected Returns and Harvest.]	This attachment was included with the comment letter. The attachment does not make a general comment regarding the plan amendments or raise a significant environmental issue.
1154	1	Opposed to adoption of SED due to impact on upstream communities.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1155	1	In 2010 the State Water Board issued a report titled Development of Flow Criteria for the Sacramento San Joaquin Delta Ecosystem that determined that approximately 60% of unimpaired flow between February and June would be fully protective of fish and wildlife in the lower San Joaquin River and its three major tributaries. At least half of the natural flow from the Stanislaus, Tuolumne, Merced and lower San Joaquin Rivers should make it to the Bay Delta. The Bay Delta forms the West Coast's largest estuary, providing habitat for more than 500 species of wildlife. It serves as a major stopover for the Pacific Flyway and as a migration pathway for salmon, steelhead and sturgeon traveling to and from their home streams to the Pacific Ocean.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1155	2	On average less than 50% of the freshwater flow from the Central Valley reaches the Bay, and in some years less than 35%. Reducing inflows shifts the size and location of the ecologically important salinity mixing zone, affecting everything from plankton to marine mammals. Between 1975 and 2014, the natural unimpaired runoff in the watershed was only low enough to create a "super critically dry'" year once, but upstream diversions captured so much runoff during those four decades that the Bay experienced "super critically dry" conditions in 19 years instead of just one.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1155	3	Reduced freshwater inflow has changed the chemistry of the Delta, enabling cyanobacteria to thrive. These blue green algae produce neurotoxins that can make people sick and kill plankton and wildlife.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1155	4	Historically, populations of spawning salmon may have exceeded 400,000 fish in the San Joaquin River Basin, but in many recent years that figure has plummeted to just a few thousand. Salmon are a keystone species, providing food for other animals and transporting nutrients from the ocean to upland habitats. More than100 species depend on salmon, so it's not just about salmon, it's about restoring our salmon based ecosystem.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1155	5	Low river flows impede fish passage, concentrate pollutants, raise water temperatures, decrease dissolved oxygen, and eliminate migratory cues for fish returning to spawn.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1155	6	Flows should be sufficient to inundate floodplains, which serve as critical habitat for juvenile salmon and other fish.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1155	7	The commercial salmon fishery in California is on the brink. The salmon population was so low in 2008 and 2009 that the commercial fishing season had to be cancelled, resulting in the loss of more than 2,200 jobs and $255 million in annual revenue.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1155	8	Through better management of snowmelt, water efficient irrigation technologies and practices, and replacing lower value, water intensive crops with higher value, water efficient crops, we could grow more food with less water. More crop per drop!	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments			
Ltr#	**Cmt#**	**Comment**	**Response**
1155	9	In the South San Joaquin Water District, a pressurized irrigation system reduced water use by 30% while increasing crop yields by 30%. In the Hetch Hetchy service area, water use decreased by 30% between 2006 and 2016 as a result of water conservation. We can accomplish great things when we all work together.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1155	10	In California, water is a public trust resource, meaning it belongs to the people of California. Water agencies have water rights, but the State can determine which beneficial uses have priority. It could be argued that food grown for Californians is a beneficial use of our water, but it's harder to make that case for exports. Agricultural exports benefit a few farmers, often corporations, at the expense of other beneficial uses.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1155	11	Please do everything in your power to protect and restore the Bay Delta. Phase I of the Bay Delta Water Quality Control Plan provides an historic opportunity to revive the largest estuary on the West Coast, in the San Joaquin River and its tributaries that are the lifeblood of the Bay Delta ecosystem from the south	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1155	12	As you are aware, the State Water Board's own report, Development of Flow Criteria for the Sacramento San Joaquin Delta Ecosystem, determined that approximately 60% of unimpaired flow between February and June would be fully protective of fish and wildlife in the lower San Joaquin River and its three major tributaries. Therefore, it's disappointing that the draft Substitute Environmental Document (SED) for Phase I of The Bay Delta Plan proposes establishing February through June unimpaired flow requirements of only 30% - 50% for the Merced, Tuolumne and Stanislaus Rivers.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1155	13	At least half of the San Joaquin River's natural flow should reach the Delta during the first six months of each year, and flows in the summer and fall should be sufficient to maintain fish and wildlife, water quality and recreational opportunities.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1155	14	Please take full advantage of this once in a generation opportunity to advance a comprehensive, long term strategy for restoring the Bay Delta ecosystem. Sufficient instream flows must be central to your decision.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1156	1	I am very concerned with your Draft Revised Substitute Environmental Document (SED) supporting Phase 1 of the Board's Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan. If approved, your proposal requiring the Merced, Tuolumne, and Stanislaus rivers to dedicate 40 percent of unimpaired flow to fish and wildlife would cause irreversible harm to our region.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment regarding the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1156	2	The Revised SED will not only financially harm our region's farmers, manufacturers and businesses, but it will directly harm organizations like ours who rely on the generosity of our community. We are an agriculturally based community; when actions are taken that directly harm the largest economic sector in the region, organizations that provide overlooked and underfunded services to our community are directly impacted.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment regarding the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1156	3	Beyond devastating our community by demanding 40 percent unimpaired flows from February 1st-June 30th annually, your staff is proposing taking over control of our locally paid for, built and operated Don Pedro Reservoir. Don Pedro was built specifically to allow our community to survive a prolonged drought, similar to the one we are currently in, but the Revised SED now limits the amount of water available to our community.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment regarding the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments			
Ltr#	**Cmt#**	**Comment**	**Response**
1156	4	Please consider the devastating impact your Revised SED will have on nonprofit organizations within our community.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment regarding the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1157	1	We are writing to strongly support the flow objectives proposed by the Board for the following reasons: San Francisco Bay is the outer-most edge of the largest estuary on the west coast of the Americas. The mixing of freshwaters from the Sacramento and San Joaquin rivers along with our local rivers and streams creates a place of rich biological abundance. But this abundance is under siege through the slow starvation of its fresh water flow. The state's complex system of water movement and use has left the San Francisco Bay a starved estuary, with nearly 50% of the freshwater that it would otherwise receive being taken out of the system. A new report by the Bay Institute shines a bright light on what State Board scientists and others have been saying for years; critical fresh water flows into San Francisco Bay have been drastically reduced, threatening the survival of fish and wildlife, degrading water quality, and shrinking our beaches and marshlands.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1157	2	In June, the people of the Bay Area made a remarkable decision to restore the wetlands that ring our amazing bay. The passage of Measure AA and the $500 million it will bring over the next 20 years will allow us to move faster to create and restore our marshes and creek mouths. This important work will help protect our bay-side communities against sea level rise while creating new places for our fish and wildlife to thrive. But without attention to the critical issue of freshwater flows, the hard work of baylands restoration will be jeopardized and $500 million in investment threatened.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1157	3	The time is now to address our freshwater flow crisis. The State Water Board's proposal for a small increase in the annual freshwater contribution from the streams on the San Joaquin River tributaries is a critical first step needed to begin to address this ecological issue. As we watch this process unfold, we are deeply concerned that this proposed small step is being bitterly opposed by numerous water users. The stark fact is that every stream and river in California is over-appropriated with cascading paper water rights. There will never be enough water to satisfy the demands of all those clamoring to take more out of waterways of the state. By law, the Water Board must balance the competing demands of the state's water users, but it is the only the Board that can act on the needs of the silent; the native fish and wildlife who will not survive as species without the intervention, now, of this Board. We urge the Board to approve the proposed flow objectives and to move ahead with Phase II and III of the work to save our fresh water-starved estuary.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1158	1	We are writing to strongly support the flow objectives proposed by the Board for the following reasons: - San Francisco Bay is the outermost edge of the largest estuary on the west coast of the Americas. The mixing of freshwaters from the Sacramento and San Joaquin rivers along with our local rivers and streams creates a place of rich biological abundance. But this abundance is under siege through the slow starvation of its freshwater flow. - The state's complex system of water movement and use has left the San Francisco Bay a starved estuary --with nearly 50% of the freshwater that it would otherwise receive being taken out of the system. A new report by the Bay Institute shines a bright light on what	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments			
Ltr#	**Cmt#**	**Comment**	**Response**
		State Board scientists and others have been saying for years; critical fresh water flows into San Francisco Bay have been drastically reduced, threatening the survival of fish and wildlife, degrading water quality, and shrinking our beaches and marshlands.	
1158	2	In June, the people of the Bay Area made a remarkable decision to restore the wetlands that ring our amazing Bay. The passage of Measure AA and the $500 million it will bring over the next 20 years will allow us to move faster to create and restore our marshes and creek mouths. This important work will help protect our bayside communities against sea level rise while creating new places for our fish and wildlife to thrive. But without attention to the critical issue of freshwater flows, the hard work of bay lands restoration will be jeopardized and $500 million in investment threatened.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1158	3	The time is now to address our freshwater flow crisis. The State Water Board's proposal for a small increase in the annual freshwater contribution from the streams on the San Joaquin River tributaries is a critical first step needed to begin to address this ecological issue. As we watch this process unfold, we are deeply concerned that this proposed small step is being bitterly opposed by numerous water users. The stark fact is that every stream and river in California is over-appropriated with cascading paper water rights. There will never be enough water to satisfy the demands of all those clamoring to take more out of waterways of the state. By law, the Water Board must balance the competing demands of the state's water users, but it is the only the Board that can act on the needs of the silent; the native fish and wildlife who will not survive as species without the intervention, now, of this Board. We urge the Board to approve the proposed flow objectives and to move ahead with Phase II and III of the work to save our freshwater-starved estuary.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1159	1	New flow standards should be higher than proposed. Scientific consensus holds that a minimum of 60 percent unimpaired flow is required to recover salmon and steelhead runs in the San Joaquin River system to self-sustaining levels.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1159	2	The water board must objectively weigh the needs of fisheries and anglers in the current process. It must consider the wide-ranging benefits that all Californians receive from healthy fisheries and river ecosystems.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1159	3	Significant opportunities exist to meet enhanced water quality standards and to save salmon from extinction in California, with minimal impact to the agricultural sector. But these opportunities must be fully considered and supported by new policy.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1159	4	California has already tried alternatives favored by large water users to save salmon and steelhead and these have failed. Dedication of more water, delivered at key times, must be the primary tactic for recovering fisheries and the Bay-Delta's ecosystem. Central Valley salmon and steelhead runs are on the brink of extinction. We can no longer afford to experiment with strategies that don't include more water (e.g. focus on removing other fish species that prey on young salmonids.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1160	1	In order to protect fish and other aquatic wildlife, and to improve the quality of river water and the environment, I support the proposal to increase water flows in the Tuolumne River, the Merced River, and the Stanislaus River between February and June each year.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments			
Ltr#	**Cmt#**	**Comment**	**Response**
1160	2	For many years most of the water has been diverted from these rivers. Studies by state agencies have shown that this leaves too little water (and too warm water) for threatened fish species to sustain their populations. Increasing the water to 30-50% of the natural flow of the rivers would still leave the majority of the water available for other purposes. Please do not be intimidated by aggressive industrial, agricultural, and political efforts to stop this proposal.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1161	1	Restore Salmon And Water Quality! 60% Inflows needed!	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1161	2	After decades of degradation from inadequate freshwater inflows, the State Water Resources Control Board (Board) is poised to take action to provide relief to the San Francisco Bay-Delta and at least some of the rivers that feed it. The Board has proposed revisions to the Bay Delta Water Quality Control Plan aimed at updating minimum flow releases for the lower San Joaquin River and Its major tributaries in order to protect fish and wildlife and control salt water intrusion in the southern Delta.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1161	3	Please submit a comment email or letter to the State Water Board urging that it adopt water quality standards that restore 50-60% of the freshwater inflows that formerly flowed into the south Delta.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1161	4	Currently, more than 60-70% of the unimpaired flow from the lower San Joaquin, Stanislaus, Tuolumne and Merced Rivers is diverted half of the time from February-June. Much of the time, NO fresh water from the upper San Joaquin River flows into Delta. This is due to massive dams on each river that divert flows for agricultural and urban use. Under the Board's preliminary recommendation, freshwater flows could range from 30-50% depending on the success of non-flow measures (such as habitat restoration), with a starting point of 40% of the unimpaired flow from February-June.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1161	5	A science-based flow criteria report released by the Board in 2010 determined that approximately 60% of natural flow between February and June would be fully protective of fish and wildlife in the San Joaquin Basin. In 2013, the California Department of Fish and Wildlife also determined that 50-60% of natural flow should remain instream to protect and restore salmon and the health of our rivers.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1161	6	Higher flows will improve the ability of salmon and other fish to m'8nrte to and from their natal streams to the ocean, reduce the concentration of river pollutants, and lower water temperatures. Flows also should be adequate to inundate floodplains, which serve as critical rearing habitat for juvenile fish.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1161	7	Historically, populations of spawning salmon exceeded 400,000 fish in these rivers, but in many recent years that figure has plummeted to just a few thousand. California's salmon population was so low in 2008 and 2009 that the commercial fishing season had to be cancelled, resulting in the loss of more than 2,200 jobs and $255 million in annual revenue.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1161	8	The Bay-Delta forms the largest estuary on the West Coast, providing habitat for more than 500 species of wildlife. It serves as a major stopover on the Pacific Flyway and as a migration pathway for salmon, steel head and sturgeon. Once a Garden of Eden, the estuary is now in desperate need of help. Due to upstream dams and diversions, the Delta no longer meets water quality standards and a host of fish species, including salmon, steelhead, and the tiny	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments			
Ltr#	**Cmt#**	**Comment**	**Response**
		Delta smelt, have declined towards extinction. The Bay Delta Plan Is a once-In-a-generation opportunity to correct decades of mismanagement.	
1161	9	The improved flows recommended by the Water Board will also enhance recreational values in three state parks (Caswell, Hatfield, and McConnell) along the lower Stanislaus and Merced Rivers, as well as in the San Joaquin River National Wildlife Refuge along the lower San Joaquin and Tuolumne Rivers.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1161	10	Through better management of snowmelt, implementation of water efficient technologies and irrigation practices, replacing water-intensive crops with water-efficient crops, and retirement of polluted and drainage Impaired agricultural lands that should have never been put under irrigation, we could grow more food with less water. California's urban communities have already demonstrated during the drought that they can reduce water use by 20-30%. By using our precious water more efficiently, we can continue to enjoy a thriving economy while restoring the rivers and waterways that make California such a special place to live and visit.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1161	11	Your voice In support of higher flows on these rivers will help to push the State Water Board to do the right thing. Unfortunately, southern San Joaquin Valley agribusiness has already mobilized a firestorm of protest against the Board's draft flow recommendations. But what the irrigators forget is that water is a public trust resource that belongs to all Californians and the Board has the responsibility to ensure that water is put to beneficial use, not only for agriculture and communities, but also for our rivers and estuaries, and the fish and wildlife that depend on them. The environmental stakes are high, as the outcome of this plan will influence a similar process just started for the Sacramento River, which feeds into the North Delta.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1161	12	Please submit a comment email or letter to the State Water Board urging that it adopt water quality standards that restore 50-60% of the freshwater inflows that formerly flowed into the south Delta.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1161	13	Thank you for your efforts to revive the San Francisco Bay-Delta and the rivers that provide it with essential freshwater inflow. We believe that 60% of the unimpaired flow on the lower San Joaquin River and its three major tributaries -the Tuolumne, Stanislaus and Merced Rivers - will be necessary to improve water quality and conditions for fish and wildlife. This is the amount determined by the Water Board's own science report. The California Dept. of Fish and Wildlife recommended restoring at least 50-60% of the unimpaired flow.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1161	14	The updated Bay Delta Water Quality Control Plan will likely be our last chance to restore populations of salmon, steel head and other aquatic organisms. These are beneficial uses of the water equal in value to irrigation and urban uses. Water is a public trust resource owned by all Californians.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1161	15	We can grow more food with less water through improved dam operations, implementation of water efficient technologies and irrigation practices, replacing water-intensive crops with water-efficient crops, and retirement of polluted and drainage-impaired ag lands that should have never been put under irrigation.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments			
Ltr#	**Cmt#**	**Comment**	**Response**
1161	16	During the recent drought, California's urban communities already demonstrated that they cities and communities can easily reduce water use by 20-30%.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1161	17	Please do everything in your power to help bring our amazing estuary, and the rivers that feed into it, back to life!	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments for responses to comments that either make a general comment on the plan amendments or do not raise significant environmental issues.
1162	1	The Revised Draft SED Fails to Consider the Demands on the Tuolumne River Water, and If These Demands Had Been Properly Considered, the Proposed Lower San Joaquin River Alternatives Would Not Withstand Scrutiny. The Revised Draft SED does not appropriately balance the factors that the State Water Board must consider when setting or revising water quality objectives. In matters such as this, Water Code section 13241 compels the State Water Board to weigh the following factors: (a) Past, present, and probable future beneficial uses of water, (b) Environmental characteristics of the hydrographic unit under consideration, including the quality of water available thereto, (c) Water quality conditions that could reasonably be achieved through the coordinated control of all factors which affect water quality in the area, (d) Economic considerations, (e) The need for developing housing within the region, and (f) The need to develop and use recycled water. As the Proposed Project is set forth in the Revised Draft SED, it fails to account for and properly balance these factors. First, the proposed update to the 2006 Water Quality Control Plan ("WQCP") improperly establishes Water Quality Objectives that would apply new regulations on the Tuolumne River and other waters outside the legal Delta without expanding the scope of the 2006 WQCP to protect these waters, designating beneficial uses for them, or undertaking the required statutory balancing of the competing interests in them. Second, the Revised Draft SED understates the importance of the City's [Modesto's] existing and future beneficial uses of water to support its planned growth and development, including housing. The Revised Draft SED also fails to consider the impact of the proposed Water Quality Objectives in light of how they would damage the regional economy, including businesses within the City. Finally, the Revised Draft SED ignores the fact that recycling water is no longer a viable source of additional supply for the City. When these factors are given the appropriate level of importance, they militate against adopting a revised water quality objective that would have such severe impacts on the affordability and reliability of local water supplies.	Please see Master Response 1.2, Water Quality Control Planning Process, for more detailed information regarding State Water Board authorities, and the consideration of beneficial uses. Please see Master Response 3.6, Service Providers regarding the availability of municipal water supply, alternative water supply sources and minimum health and safety needs. Please see Master Response 8.4, Non-Agricultural Economic Considerations, regarding the municipal costs, and potential effects on growth, economic development, and urban decay in the plan area.
1162	2	The Statutory Requirements to Effect the Proposed Changes to the 2006 Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan Have Not Been Met, So the State Water Board Cannot Lawfully Adopt the Proposed Amendments. Here, the Proposed Project consists of proposed amendments to certain water quality objectives imposed in the 2006 Bay-Delta WQCP. The Revised Draft SED specifically	Please see Master Response 2.1, Amendments to the Water Quality Control Plan, regarding the geographic scope of the plan area. The State Water Board expanded the geographic scope of the Bay-Delta Plan to include the LSJR and its three eastside tributaries pursuant to authorities granted by the Porter-Cologne Act and the California Water Code (Wat. Code §§ 13170, 13240-13244). For example, Appendix K states, "This Water Quality Control Plan covers the Bay-Delta Estuary and tributary watersheds (Bay-Delta Plan or Plan)." The fish and wildlife beneficial uses sought to be protected by the plan amendments in the Stanislaus,

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		describes the Proposed Project as follows: The project (plan amendments) would establish the following updates to the 2006 Bay-Delta Plan: ☐ New flow objectives on the Lower San Joaquin River (LSJR) and its three eastside tributaries for the protection of fish and wildlife beneficial uses. ☐ Revised water quality objectives for the protection of agricultural beneficial uses in the southern Delta. ☐ A program of implementation to achieve these objectives. ☐ Monitoring and special studies necessary to fill information needs and determine the effectiveness of, and compliance with, the new objectives. The new LSJR flow objectives and revised southern Delta water quality (SDWQ) objective and associated program of implementation would replace the existing San Joaquin River (SJR) flow and southern Delta salinity objectives and associated program of implementation in the 2006 Bay-Delta Plan. Revised Draft SED, p. 1- 1. Except as expressly set forth above, the Proposed Project would leave the provisions of the 2006 WQCP intact. The 2006 WQCP explicitly limits the scope of its application: "The water quality objectives in this plan apply to waters of the San Francisco Bay system and the legal Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, as specified in the objectives." 2006 WQCP, p. 10, emphasis added. Furthermore, all of the beneficial uses designated within the 2006 WQCP, which serve as the basis for establishing appropriate water quality objectives, relate to uses of water within the legal Delta. 2006 WQCP, pp. 8 - 9. Thus, like its predecessors, the 2006 Bay-Delta WQCP protects the municipal and industrial uses of water within the Delta by users such as Contra Costa Water District. The 2006 WQCP also designates Lower San Joaquin River water quality objectives to be met at Vernalis, which is the southernmost point within the legal Delta. In contrast, the waters of the Merced, Tuolumne, and Stanislaus Rivers, on the other hand, are not within the legal Delta. The Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board has set the water quality objectives for these rivers in the Central Valley Basin Plan. In setting these water quality objectives, the Central Valley Board balanced the competing uses of these sources of water and weighed the water needs of aquatic species against the other beneficial uses of the water. See Water Code §§ 13000 (when setting water quality objectives, the board must consider "all demands being made and to be made on those waters"), 13241 (requiring the boards to consider the water quality objective's impact on factors such as past, present and future beneficial uses of the water; economic considerations; and housing). Here, the appropriate procedures have not been followed, and, as a result, the required statutory balancing has been neglected. As shown above, the description of the Proposed Project does not include expanding the scope of the 2006 WQCP to protect waters outside of the legal Delta. See Revised Draft SED, p. 1-1. Likewise, it does not propose to establish beneficial uses for any of the waters of the San Joaquin River or its tributaries that are	Tuolumne, and Merced Rivers and the San Joaquin River from the mouth of the Merced River to Vernalis are already designated in the Water Quality Control Plan for the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River Basins. The fish and wildlife beneficial uses exist, are presumptive uses under the Clean Water Act (see 40 C.F.R. § 131.10(j).), and have been designated. Accordingly, the State Water Board is required to protect these uses. As explained below, flows have been insufficient to reasonably protect fish and wildlife beneficial uses in these areas and the State Water Board is uniquely equipped to address the problem. The Bay-Delta Plan works in concert with the Central Valley and San Francisco Bay Regional Water Board water quality control plans to protect beneficial uses. For example, the 2006 Bay-Delta Plan states, "This chapter establishes water quality objectives which, in conjunction with the water quality objectives for the Bay-Delta Estuary that are included in other State Water Board adopted water quality control plans and in water quality control plans for the Central Valley and San Francisco Bay Basins, when implemented, will: (1) provide for reasonable protection of municipal, industrial, and agricultural beneficial uses; (2) provide reasonable protection of fish and wildlife beneficial uses at a level which stabilizes or enhances the conditions of aquatic resources; and (3) prevent nuisance." To avoid further confusion, Appendix K has been revised to make clear that the proposed flow objectives are to protect the fish and wildlife beneficial uses designated in Sacramento River Basin and San Joaquin River Basin Plan. The consideration of the factors in Water Code section 13241 only applies to establishing water quality objectives, not, as the commenter suggests, to beneficial designations. Please see Master Response 1.2, Water Quality Control Plan Process, for the State Water Board's consideration of these factors, which have and continue to be considered for the LSJR watershed, not just the Delta. The commenter refers to the Central Valley Regional Water Board's balancing of Water Code section 13241 factors. Please note, however, that it has not adopted flow water quality objectives to protect fish and wildlife beneficial uses; rather, it has adopted other objectives for pollutants that are to be achieved "primarily through the adoption of waste discharge requirements (including permits) and cleanup and abatement orders" (see Water Quality Control Plan for the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins). To the extent the commenter is suggesting that the State Water Board's lacks authority to adopt water quality control plans beyond the legal Delta, the commenter is incorrect. Unlike regional water board water quality control plans, the geographic scope of State Water Board water quality control plans is not pre-determined. (See, e.g., Wat. Code §§ 13170, 13240.) The Bay-Delta is an unparalleled resource providing drinking water not just within the Bay-Delta, but to two thirds of California, and "water for a multitude of other urban uses, and it supplies some of the State's most productive agricultural areas, both inside and outside" of the Bay-Delta. (Bay-Delta Plan, 2006, p. 1.) "It is also one of the largest ecosystems for fish and wildlife habitat and production in the United States." (Ibid.) But the Bay-Delta is also in ecological crisis. (Executive Summary.) The State Water Board is uniquely equipped to address this crisis and adopt the proposed amendments because of its dual responsibilities of protecting the state's water resources and allocating water supply. Implementation of the Bay-Delta Plan necessarily involves "assigning responsibilities to water right holders because parameters to be controlled are primarily impacted by flows and diversions." (Bay-Delta Plan, 2006, p. 1.) It is well within the State Water Board's broad powers and responsibilities to establish water quality objectives for areas upstream of the Bay-Delta in the Bay-Delta Plan to reasonably protect fish and wildlife beneficial uses. The fish and wildlife beneficial uses of the three salmon-bearing tributaries of the Lower San Joaquin River, the Stanislaus, Tuolumne, and Merced Rivers, have been affected by insufficient flows. Sufficient inflow conditions for these waters during February to June period, an important period for several critical life stages of salmon, is necessary to protect native migratory fish migrating through these upstream

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments			
Ltr#	**Cmt#**	**Comment**	**Response**
		outside of the legal Delta. Id. However, the Revised Draft SED indicates that "the LSJR flow objectives would require flows below the rim dams on the Stanislaus, Tuolumne, and Merced Rivers, and the mainstem of the LSJR between the confluence of the Merced River to Vernalis to protect fish and wildlife beneficial uses in those reaches." Revised Draft SED, p. 1-1. In other words, the Proposed Project seeks to extend the regulations imposed by the Water Quality Objectives upstream, beyond the legal Delta, but State Water Board staff have not undertaken all of the steps necessary to amend the 2006 WQCP to effect this change. Before the Board amends the Bay-Delta Plan to impose new Water Quality Objectives on waters outside the legal Delta, it must first designate the beneficial uses of those waters. The Revised Draft SED fails to complete this necessary prerequisite. The Board then must develop Water Quality Objectives to provide reasonable protection for the designated beneficial uses of these waters, taking into account the other demands and beneficial uses. Water Code§§ 13000, 13241. Here, the Revised Draft SED proposes to amend the 2006 Bay-Delta WQCP to impose new Water Quality Objectives on the tributaries to the San Joaquin River, which are not within the legal Delta, are not within the waters protected by the Bay-Delta WQCP, and are instead covered by the Central Valley Basin Plan. The Revised Draft SED does not identify or establish the beneficial uses of these waters. Thus, the Revised Draft SED does not comply with the statutory obligation to consider the other demands and beneficial uses of the waters that will be subject to the regulation before setting a water quality objective. Rather, like the WQCP that was disapproved in United States u. State Water Resources Control Bd., 182 Cal. App. 3d 96 (1986), the analysis of the Proposed Project considers "only the water use of the Delta parties... and the needs of the customers served by the projects..." that take water from the Delta, while ignoring the beneficial uses of water upstream. Id. at 118. This approach violates the Board's obligations to consider all competing demands for water as well as "past, present, and probable future beneficial uses of water" and the other factors mandated by Water Code section 13241. Id. Yet the Revised Draft SED inexplicably repeats the same procedural mistake that Justice Racanelli disapproved in 1986. In amending the 2006 Bay-Delta WQCP to extend Water Quality Objectives outside the legal Delta, the State Water Board cannot meet its statutory obligations without determining the beneficial uses of the waters to be included and performing the required balancing of interests. How the proposed new objective will affect the past, present and future beneficial uses of water in the Bay-Delta, the economy of the Bay-Delta, and the housing of the Bay-Delta is not relevant when all of the impacts of this decision would be felt in the upstream areas outside of the legal Delta. The Proposed Lower San Joaquin River alternatives cannot be lawfully imposed until these necessary procedural steps - expanding the scope of the protected waters, making specific findings regarding then designated beneficial uses, and performing the required balancing of interests - are taken.	rivers and the Bay-Delta. The Bay-Delta is not an isolated water body—the quality of upstream tributaries affects the quality of the Bay-Delta waters and native migratory fish populations migrate through both the Bay-Delta and its upstream tributaries. It is, therefore, necessary to address the quality of those upstream waters as well as the Bay-Delta to reasonably protect fish and wildlife beneficial uses. In addition, diversions of water within and upstream of the Bay-Delta are key drivers of water quality in the Bay-Delta, and the Board is well within its authority to protect Bay-Delta water quality by addressing upstream flow. (See State Water Res. Control Bd. Cases, supra, 136 Cal.App.4th at pp. 701–02 [“a flow objective sets the amount of water that must be flowing in a watercourse at a given time for ‘the reasonable protection of beneficial uses of [the] water,’” citing Wat. Code, § 13050, subd. (h)].) “Obviously, meeting [a flow] objective may be achieved, among other ways, by reducing the amount of water that upstream water right holders divert from the watercourse or by increasing the amount of water released into the watercourse.” (Ibid.)
1162	3	The Proposed Lower San Joaquin River Alternatives Do Not Reflect an Appropriate Weight for the City's Beneficial Uses of Water to Support Its Planned Growth and Development of Housing. The City of Modesto delivers water that is then used for municipal, industrial and industrial processing purposes. These "beneficial uses" of water are protected by both the · Water Quality Control Plan for the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley	Please see Master Response 1.2, Water Quality Control Planning Process, regarding State Water Board authorities related to the water quality control planning process, including a discussion of Water Code section 13050 requirements. Please see Master Response 8.4, Non-Agricultural Economic Considerations, for a discussion of municipal economic effects, including growth and economic development.

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		Region (4th ed., July 2016) ["Central Valley Basin Plan"], and State Water Board Resolution No . 88-63, "Sources of Drinking Water Policy" ["SWRCB Drinking Water Policy"]. Central Valley Basin Plan, at IV-9.00, citing SWRCB Drinking Water Policy [other than under specifically defined exceptions, all surface and ground waters of the state are to be protected as existing or potential sources of municipal and domestic supply]. In its proposed updates to the Water Quality Objectives of the Water Quality Control Plan for the San Francisco Bay/Sacramento -San Joaquin Delta Estuary, the State Water Board must therefore take into consideration the City's "past, present and probable future beneficial uses" of water for municipal, industrial, and industrial processing purposes. Water Code§ 13050(f), (j). The City of Modesto currently receives approximately half of its annual drinking water supply from Tuolumne River surface water through a contract it has with the Modesto Irrigation District, a true and correct copy of which is attached as Exhibit A [ATT 1]. The City plans to use the surface water provided by Modesto Irrigation District to meet the City's long-term drinking water needs. In exchange for this supply, over 20 years ago, the City committed to fund the Modesto Regional Water Treatment Plant. This deal allowed the City to diversify its water portfolio and to help protect local groundwater supplies. Modesto is currently investing over $300 million in water infrastructure to provide reliability for residents, business, and major industry, including $160 million in the next 5 years based on extensive analysis and planning that included anticipated future use of current surface water supplies. As the Revised Draft SED reveals, though, the proposed amendments to the Water Quality Objectives will cut surface water deliveries by 38% in critically dry years. The proposed project's severe reductions in surface water deliveries threaten all of the City's long-term wate1·planning efforts and investments. Obviously, affordable and reliable water supplies in adequate quantities are a cornerstone to a city's ability to plan its growth and meet its general economic development goals. In fact, the California Water Code requires cities and counties to examine the sufficiency of water supplies before they approve new development. See, e.g., Cal. Water Code §§ 10910, et seq. The Central Basin Water Quality Control Plan recognizes that "the protection and enhancement of beneficial uses require that certain quality and quantity objectives be met for surface and ground waters." Id. at II-1.00, emphasis added. Without water, the City's ability to attain the amount of growth planned under its General Plan - some of which is legally mandated - will be frustrated.	
1162	4	The Proposed Water Quality Objectives Threaten the City's Past, Present and Future Beneficial Use of Surface Water to Recharge Groundwater Supplies and Manage the Groundwater Basin in a Sustainable Manner. Groundwater is an important source of water supply to the City [of Modesto], comprising the source of more than half of the water the City delivers. In many parts of the City's service area, groundwater provides the primary water source. The City has been actively managing its groundwater pumping for decades, ahead of SGMA, to try to keep the withdrawals at a sustainable level. The City and the other local water supply agencies have been very successful in this regard: of all the groundwater basins in the areas of the San Joaquin Valley that have active agricultural communities, Stanislaus County has the only basins that have not been designated as "critically overdrafted." In fact, due to the City's efforts, the groundwater levels in the City of Modesto's contiguous system	The State Water Board acknowledges the City of Modesto's groundwater management effort and ongoing commitment to groundwater sustainability. Please refer to Master Response 3.6, Service Providers, for responses to comments related to availability of drinking water and alternative water supplies. Please refer to Master Response 3.4, Groundwater and the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act, regarding groundwater and SGMA. Please refer to Master Response 8.4, Non-Agricultural Economic Considerations, for responses to comments related to stranded capital costs (e.g., investments in expanded or new water treatment plants).

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments			
Ltr#	**Cmt#**	**Comment**	**Response**
		have been stable since 1995. See, generally, City of Modesto 2015 Urban Water Management Plan, a true and correct copy of which is attached as Exhibit B [ATT 2]; DWR contour maps, true and correct copies of which are attached as Exhibit C [ATT 3]. Preventing that level of overuse of the local groundwater resources has taken a lot of effort, planning and expenditures by the City of Modesto and other local agencies. Aquifer Storage and Recovery, also known as "ASR," depends on additional surface water being available for recharge. To that end, the City entered into its surface water supply contract with Modesto Irrigation District and has made investments in the surface water treatment plant to allow it to incorporate greater surface water supplies in its portfolio. If the Board adopts the alternative and reduces the City's available surface water supplies, the City has no source of water to treat or "bank" to continue to improve the status of the aquifer. By compromising the surface water supply that the City is using to balance its demand for groundwater, the staff-proposed alternative not only undermines the financial viability of the surface water treatment plant, but also threatens to undo all of the City's hard work to protect the local groundwater basins.	
1162	5	The Proposed Water Quality Objectives Would Unduly Hinder the Regional Economy, Including the Businesses within the City. Water is also a key input to the region's - and the City's [Modesto's] - financial health. To be financially viable in California after the passage of Proposition XIII, cities need to have healthy business tax bases. Modesto's economic development is largely based on a stable and vibrant agricultural economy. Fortunately for our city, California does have a thriving agricultural economy. In fact, California is the nation's leading producer of agricultural products. In 2012, California's farms and ranches accounted for $42.6 billion in output, with milk production being California's largest agricultural industry. Dairy products such as milk, butter, cheese, evaporated products and frozen desserts, and dairy processing directly accounted for $3.37 billion in value added. California's grape production, the state's second largest industry, accounts for $3.65 billion in direct value added. Fruit and vegetable canning, pickling, and drying, along with soft drink and ice manufacturing, added another $6.58 billion in direct valued-added sales. These sectors account for more than 220,000 California jobs. These are statewide figures, but each and every one of these sectors is largely representative of the businesses operating directly in and around the City of Modesto. Here, as is the case throughout the San Joaquin Valley, many of the commercial businesses depend on or support agricultural production, such as food and beverage processors, wineries, canneries, dairies and other enterprises that help to process, market and sell agricultural products . In 2012, the food and beverage processing industry in Stanislaus County employed approximately 25,000 people, generated more than $8.6 billion in sector output, and added over $2.3 billion in value to the local economy. As several speakers at the Board's December 20, 2016 hearing on the SED noted, the City of Modesto's official motto is "Water, Wealth, Contentment, and Health." This simple motto reflects not only civic pride, but also the paradigm that supports the regional community. Modesto is the largest city in Stanislaus County and home to major food and beverage processors such as Gallo Wines, Frito Lay, Del Monte, Stanislaus Foods, and Seneca Foods,	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, for general information regarding the economic analysis. Please see Master Response 8.1, Local Agricultural Economic Effects and the SWAP model, regarding the long-term economic effects of changes in water supply availability, and agricultural economic effects, groundwater pumping and SGMA. Please see Master Response 8.2, Regional Agricultural Economic Effects, for discussion of the economic analysis performed by Stratecon, Inc., and for a discussion of the potential economic effects on food processors.

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		all of which need a stable water supply to be productive and profitable. By reducing the available water supply and impairing its reliability, the Proposed Project will have a devastating effect on the long-term viability of the local food and beverage processing operations. The reduction in water, with no identified source of replacement, means that the proposed Water Quality Objectives will likely result in huge job losses and huge reductions in agricultural output in the region. A 2015 economic study confirms how water is and always has been essential to the vibrancy of Modesto. This study, "The Economic Impact of Food and Beverage Processing in California and Its Cities and Counties," which was undertaken by Professor Richard J. Sexton, Professor and Chair of the Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics at the University of California, Davis, found, "Food and beverage processing is responsible for 20% or more of all jobs in Kings, Merced, and Stanislaus Counties...." (A true and correct copy of this study is attached as Exhibit D [ATT 4].) More recent studies have further confirmed that the amount of water reductions imposed under the proposed project would cripple the City's local economy. At the December 20, 2016 hearing, the Board received testimony and a PowerPoint presentation from Stanislaus County consultants Dr. Rodney Smith and Jason Bass of Stratecon, Inc. regarding the direct economic impacts the proposed Water Quality Objectives would have on agricultural water users as well as the indirect effects the reduction in agricultural output would have on urban water users whose jobs and businesses are linked to agricultural water users. Page 31 of the Stratecon PowerPoint provides an economic Impact Summary that indicates that during non-peak and peak years, job losses resulting from the draft proposal (not including SGMA-caused job losses) would range from 1,513 to 6,653. (A true and correct copy of the Stratecon PowerPoint is attached as Exhibit E [ATT 5].) Simply put, the regional economy cannot absorb job losses of this magnitude. The severe economic impacts of the proposed project must be given appropriate weight, and the State Water Board must fulfill its statutory obligation to take account of these economic considerations.	
1162	6	The Proposed Water Quality Objectives Fail to Recognize That the City Cannot Make Up a Water Supply Deficit by Developing and Using Recycled Water, Since It Has Already Committed That Source. The City of Modesto paid over $130 million to fund construction of a tertiary treatment plant to develop recycled water for delivery to Del Puerto Water District. That recycled water is delivered through the Delta-Mendota Canal and then put to beneficial use providing irrigation for agriculture within Del Puerto's service area. The City has also invested about $50 million more to cover its share of the $100 million in costs to build the recycled water delivery facilities. This project is currently under construction, and it is expected to be completed in December 2017. Ironically, the State Water Board and other state agencies supported and approved this project because it helps reduce Del Puerto's reliance on water imported from the Delta. However, because the City undertook this progressive project, which helps to protect water in the Delta, this source of recycled water is no longer available to the City. Given this existing commitment to Del Puerto, the SED's proposed Water Quality Objectives put the City in a worse position than it would have been if it had not undertaken this project.	Please refer to Master Response 8.4, Non-Agricultural Economic Considerations, regarding supply uncertainty and effects on water supply infrastructure planning. Please see Master Response 3.6, Service Providers, regarding the availability of municipal water supply, and alternative water supply sources.
1162	7	The Revised Draft SED's CEQA Analysis Is Deficient.	Please see Master Response 3.2, Surface Water Analyses and Modeling, regarding the Water Supply Effects (WSE) model as an appropriate tool to evaluate water supply effects and potential environmental impacts

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments			
Ltr#	**Cmt#**	**Comment**	**Response**
		The Revised Draft SED Fails to Analyze the Potential Impacts of the Proposed Changes to the Water Quality Objectives on the City's [Modesto's] Water Supplies. When a project will cause changes in streamflow or water supply, CEQA requires the lead agency to analyze the potential environmental effects of those changes. Protect the Historic Amador Waterways v. Amador Water Agency, 116 Cal. App. 4th 1099, 1109, 1101 (2004); Santiago County Water Dist. v. County of Orange, 118 Cal. App. 3d 818, 831 (1981) [EIR failed to provide adequate information about the project's impacts on water supplies where it was "silent on the effect of that delivery [to the proposed project] on water service elsewhere in the Water District's jurisdiction."]; see also Vineyard Area Citizens for Responsible Growth, Inc. v. City of Rancho Cordova, 40 Cal. 4th 412, 430-32 (2007). Water supply impacts constitute physical impacts on the environment. See Pub. Res. Code§ 21060.5 [defining "environment" to include water conditions "which exist within the area which will be affected by a proposed project"]. Thus, when a project causes changes in the amount of water that the water suppliers will be able to deliver, the environmental impacts of those changes must be evaluated. Central Delta Water Agency v. State Water Resources Control Bd., 124 Cal. App. 245, 271 (2004); see also Voices for Rural Living v. El Dorado Irrig. Dist., 209 Cal. App. 4th 1096, 1112 (2012) [where combined effects of climate change, increased future demands and project will reduce water supplies available to district and exacerbate the severity or environmental effects of future drought conditions, the lead agency must analyze those potential environmental impacts]. To determine the scope of a project's water supply impacts, agencies perform hydrological modeling to estimate what the water supplies would be with and without the project. See, e.g., Dry Creek Citizens Coalition v. County of Tulare, 70 Cal. App. 4th 20, 32- 33(1999); see also Planning and Conservation League v. Dept. of Water Resources, 83 Cal. App. 4th 892, 919 (2000) [faulting DWR for ignoring "repeated requests . . . to provide forecasts based on [hydrological] simulation models. . .."]. The SED does not accurately model, and therefore fails to quantify or analyze, the water supply impacts to the City of Modesto. The City operates a conjunctive use water supply system. To serve the demand of its customers, the City uses both surface water obtained under a long-term contract with Modesto Irrigation District and groundwater pumped through the City's separately owned, managed and maintained facilities. The SED does not correctly evaluate the impacts to either one of the City's two water supply sources.	for the programmatic analyses contained in the SED. It is acknowledged in Chapter 13, Service Providers, Section 13.3.3, Regional or Local, that Modesto relies on a conjunctive water use strategy with two primary sources: groundwater and surface water from the Tuolumne River purchased from Modesto Irrigation District. As explained in Chapter 13, the extent to which water suppliers are affected by a reduction in surface water depends on many factors, including the mechanism by which they obtain water, contracts, policies, the type of water use they supply, and their ability to rely on or obtain alternative water supplies. The SED's analysis is necessarily programmatic, not project-specific. Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, regarding the programmatic nature of the analysis in the SED, and the general methods and modeling used in the SED. Please see also Master Response 1.2, Water Quality Control Planning Process, regarding implementation through water rights proceedings. Please also see Master Response 3.6, Service Providers, for additional clarifying information regarding service providers and potential effects. The commenter relies on cases in which courts held that EIRs were deficient for failing to adequately identify sources of water needed for development projects to argue that the SED should have specifically analyzed and quantified impacts on the City of Modesto's water supplies. The plan amendments do not involve large residential or commercial development projects, which are subject to specific statutory requirements for a water supply assessment to be completed and included in an EIR. (Wat. Code, §§ 10910-10912.) In addition, in the very case cited by the commenter, the California Supreme Court recognized that "[t]he ultimate question under CEQA … is not whether an EIR establishes a likely source of water, but whether it adequately addresses the reasonably foreseeable impacts of supplying water to the project." Vineyard Area Citizens for Responsible Growth, Inc. v. City of Rancho Cordova (2007) 40 Cal.4th 412, 434. Consistent with this principle and CEQA's requirement to identify and focus on significant impacts on the environment, the SED analyzes the environmental impacts of obtaining alternative water supplies due to reduced surface water. See Chapter 16, Evaluation of Other Indirect and Additional Actions.
1162	8	Because the Water Supply Effects Model Erroneously Assumes That the City [of Modesto] Will Receive the Same Amount of Surface Water Even If the Proposed Water Quality Objectives Were Implemented, the Revised Draft SED Understates the Impact the Project Would Have on the City's Surface Water Supplies. For each proposed Lower San Joaquin River alternative, the Revised Draft SED relies on the Water Supply Effects model to estimate the amount of diversions that would be available from the river with the implementation of the proposed Water Quality Objectives. When the results of the Water Supply Effects modeling were post-processed, the volumes of water currently being used for municipal and industrial water supplies were "assumed not to be subject to a water shortage" and thus "were subtracted from the total diversions for each river to calculate how much water remained" for other users. In other words, for purposes of calculating Water Supply Effects, the model simply assumes that supplies to	Please see Chapter 13, Service Providers, for programmatic impact determinations and a discussion of potential effects on service providers using surface water, especially within the general context of water supply agreements. Please see Master Response 3.6, Service Providers, for clarifying information regarding service providers and potential effects. Master Response 1.1, General Comments, provides a general discussion of the overall approach in the SED and the programmatic nature of the analysis. Master Response 3.2, Surface Water Analyses and Modeling, clarifies how municipal supplies were assumed not to change in the modeling analysis in order to best assess the potential effects of LSJR alternatives on agricultural water use that accounts for the majority of diversions. Chapter 13, Service Providers, states that "Service providers that rely heavily or primarily on surface water diversions to supply water to their service areas could experience significant reductions in water supply, depending on the various factors described above (i.e., mechanism by which they receive the water, existing policies, regulations, and the type of water use they supply)."

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments			
Ltr#	**Cmt#**	**Comment**	**Response**
		municipal service providers would not be reduced: the model projects that, even with the revised Water Quality Objective and the imposition of flow standards that reduce available surface water supplies, the City of Modesto will receive the same surface water deliveries as it is receiving under existing conditions. As the SWRCB's staff and consultants explained in the December 5, 2016 workshop on the Water Supply Effects modeling, the effects analysis "did not modify the amount of water available to the water treatment plants." In terms of the Water Supply Effects analysis, the presenters at the workshop explained "that [reduction in supply] falls on the irrigation districts rather than the municipalities." Subsequently, at the December 12, 2016 workshop, the State Water Board consultants and staff noted that the surface water supplies available to the City of Modesto were estimated as part of the water supplies available to Modesto Irrigation District. However, as noted at the December 5 workshop, rather than calculating the amount of water that the City would lose if the alternatives were implemented, the Revised Draft SED employs a "unique allocation scheme" that represents "simply a way of reoperating the system that constrains deliveries in a way that works." Using this reoperation scheme, the Revised Draft SED assumes that the surface water that Modesto Irrigation District delivers to the City was "fully delivered each year." The assumptions that the system will be "reoperated" and deliveries to the City will continue at the same amount constitute fatal flaws in the model, which cause the Revised Draft SED to understate the Project's potential water supply impacts to the City. As the State Water Board has acknowledged, the City receives its surface water supply under a contract with Modesto Irrigation District. That contract does not prioritize the delivery of surface water to the City over deliveries to other Modesto Irrigation District customers. Rather, Section 17.1 of the agreement explicitly provides that the City's surface water supplies are subject to shortage when Modesto Irrigation District's supplies are short: District promises and agrees to treat District's agricultural customers and City on a parity basis. If District is required to reduce deliveries, it will cut back its deliveries to its agricultural customers and to City in equal proportions. Exh. A, § 17.1. There is no factual basis to support the SED's assumptions that the system will be "reoperated" so that the impacts of the proposed actions will fall entirely on irrigation demands and the City's surface water supplies will be unaffected. Consequently, the modeling results understate the project's water supply impacts on the City.	It would be speculative to make specific determinations of how irrigation districts might change deliveries to municipal suppliers in their communities that can rely both on surface and groundwater conjunctively. Based purely on the value of water for municipal use, it would be unreasonable to assume that the trend toward providing more surface water to municipal service providers would be reversed suddenly by implementation of the plan amendments. Based on commenter's information that Modesto ID would cut back deliveries to the City on a parity basis, Chapter 13, Service Providers, Table 13-14 indicates an average reduction of Tuolumne River supplies of approximately 14 percent on a long-term basis, more in some years. The SED does not speculate how parties may renegotiate such agreements.
1162	9	The Water Supply Effects Model Understates the City's [Modesto's] Future Level of Demand and Therefore Does Not Accurately Depict the Project's Impact on the City's Planned Future Beneficial Use of Water. The Water Supply Effects model also erroneously assumes that the City's demand for surface water will remain at the 2009 baseline level throughout the duration of the Lower San Joaquin River Water Quality Objective. This assumption is unrealistic. As the economy has recovered since 2009, the City's water demand and deliveries have increased. Consistent with its legal obligations, the City has adopted a General Plan that plans for its long-term growth, and it has analyzed and planned for the additional water demand that this growth will generate. The City's agreement with Modesto Irrigation District accommodates the City's need for more surface water to meet future demand, but the Proposed Project undercuts that source of supply. By holding the City at an artificially low 2009 level of surface water demand, the Water Supply Effects model obfuscates the	See response to comment 1162-8. The SED appropriately focuses on impacts on existing conditions, rather than future conditions. Please see Master Response 2.5, Baseline and No Project, for how baseline characterizes the existing environment at the time of the 2009 Notice of Preparation.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments			
Ltr#	**Cmt#**	**Comment**	**Response**
		magnitude of the water supply deficit that the Proposed Project will cause for the City. By ignoring the City's planned future beneficial use of this water, the Revised Draft SED violates both CEQA and Water Code section 13241.	
1162	10	The State Water Board Must Correct the Faulty Assumptions of the Water Supply Effects Model and Re- Run the Model to Determine the Proposed Project's Potential Water Supply Impacts to the City [of Modesto]. As a result of the faulty assumptions detailed above, the Water Supply Effects model is defective. Where, as here, the model is clearly inadequate to forecast or evaluate the project's full spectrum of possible impacts, it does not constitute substantial evidence of the project's potential water supply impacts. East Sacramento Partnership for a Livable City v. City of Sacramento, 5 Cal. App. 5th 281, 299 (2016); Town of Atherton v. California High-Speed Rail Authority, 228 Cal. App. 4th 314, 349 (2014); State Water Resources Control Bd. Cases, 136 Cal. App. 4th 674, 795 (2006). As shown above, the false assumptions in the Water Supply Effects model render invalid its analysis of the Proposed Project's impacts on the City's surface water supply. For the State Water Board to determine the actual scope of this project's impacts on the City's surface water supply, it must correct these errors and re-run the modeling analysis.	See response to comment 1162-8. Chapter 13, Service Providers, properly accounts for potential significant and unavoidable impacts on service providers, such as the City of Modesto, based on changes in overall availability of surface water. Also, please see Master Response 3.2, Surface Water Analyses and Modeling, regarding the Water Supply Effects (WSE) model as an appropriate tool to evaluate water supply effects and potential environmental impacts for the programmatic analyses contained in the SED.
1162	11	The Errors in the Water Supply Effects Modeling Results Infect the Revised Draft SED's Calculation of the Impact on the City's Groundwater Supplies. Because the Revised Draft SED erroneously assumes that the City will receive the same level of surface water supplies under the Proposed Project, it also understates the Proposed Project's impacts on the City's groundwater supplies. The results of the Water Supply Effects model were used as the input to the model that was used to estimate groundwater effects. As shown above, the Water Supply Effects model contains faulty assumptions, so it incorrectly indicated the City's surface water supplies would not be reduced. The Revised Draft SED used this result - no surface water supply reduction – as the input for the groundwater effects model. The groundwater effects model therefore fails to account for the increased groundwater demand that the City will have due to the Proposed Project's reduction in the City's surface water supplies. Consequently, the groundwater effects model underestimates the impacts to the City's groundwater supplies.	See response to comment 1162-8. Chapter 13, Service Providers, properly accounts for potential significant and unavoidable impacts on service providers such as the City of Modesto based on changes in overall availability of surface water. In the case that the City of Modesto may rely on groundwater as a reaction to reduced surface water availability, such impacts would not be additive to groundwater pumping already considered for the Modesto Groundwater Basin as a result of additional Modesto ID pumping, and estimated in Chapter 9, Groundwater Resources, and Appendix G, Agricultural Economic Effects of Lower San Joaquin River Flow Alternatives: Methodology and Modeling Results. The analysis of groundwater use subsequent to WSE model assuming that water would be available for the City of Modesto, attributes all surface water shortage to Modesto ID, which is offset by compensating groundwater pumping. Such change in impact to the groundwater basin could simply be attributed to the City rather than Modesto ID, in the case that Modesto ID used water for irrigation rather than deliveries to the City, and would not cause significant additional changes in regional groundwater supply within the basin.
1162	12	The Groundwater Effects Model Fails to Include Accurate Estimates of the City's Groundwater Demands and Falsely Assumes the City Can Meet Future Needs by Increasing Pumping to 2009 Levels. Although the Revised Draft SED models the impacts to the groundwater supplies for the irrigation districts, it inexplicably fails to model or quantify the impacts to the City's groundwater supply. The impacts to the City's groundwater supplies are reasonably foreseeable and capable of being estimated using the models; this step cannot be skipped. "When an agency preparing an EIR is obliged to examine future events that are difficult to forecast, the agency 'must use its best efforts to find out and disclose all that it reasonably can.'" Planning and Conservation League v. Castaic Lake Water Agency, 180 Cal. App. 4th 210, 242 (2009); State CEQA Guidelines, 14 C.C.R. § 15144. In fact, for the Turlock subbasin, the groundwater modeling neglects even to identify the City of Modesto as one of the users of that groundwater, when publicly available data confirm that the City withdraws about 5000 acre-feet per year from that subbasin. The Revised Draft SED's failure to include the	The SED is a program-level document that made reasonable assumptions regarding groundwater impacts based on substantial evidence. The SED was not required to describe and assess speculative city-specific impacts for the City of Modesto. As stated in Planning and Conservation League v. Castaic Lake Water Agency, 180 Cal.App.4th 210, 241 an environmental document must contain "sufficient information about a proposed project, the site and surrounding area and the projected environmental impacts arising as a result of the propose project or activity to allow for an informed decision." Unlike Castaic, which was a project-specific water transfer, the decision here is for a programmatic regulatory action. Nevertheless, information concerning the City of Modesto is included. Chapter 9, Groundwater Resources, identifies that the City of Modesto satisfies approximately half of its demand with Modesto Irrigation District (MoId) surface water and half with groundwater from its own wells. The SED analysis relied upon the Joint 2010 Urban Water Management Plan by the City of Modesto and MoID for this information. In addition, Chapter 9 incorporates and acknowledges information from the City of Modesto 2008 Turlock Groundwater Basin Draft Groundwater Management Plan. For the purposes of impact analysis in the SED, the plan area is divided into sub-areas depending on the

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		City's demand in the Turlock subbasin confirms that the SED's groundwater modeling is clearly inadequate and cannot be used as substantial evidence to support the SED's conclusions about the project's impacts. For the other subbasins, the SED's groundwater modeling identifies the City as a water user, but the Revised Draft SED simply assumes that future municipal demands can be met with increased groundwater pumping. At the December 12 workshop, State Water Board staff and consultants indicated that the groundwater model "assumes districts can increase their groundwater pumping up to the maximum capacity" using a 2009 baseline. Given the new legal framework imposed by SGMA, increasing pumping up to the maximum capacity does not appear to be a legally feasible method of resolving the water supply deficits imposed by the Proposed Water Quality Objectives. Indeed, at the workshop, the State Water Board staff was not willing to state whether the 2009 baseline level of groundwater pumping would be sustainable under SGMA. Considering that admission, the record lacks substantial evidence to support the conclusion that pumping can be increased up to the maximum capacity attained in 2009. Thus, the groundwater modeling contains inaccurate assumptions that mask the Proposed Project's potential impacts on the City's water supplies. In fact, if the City is not able to increase its groundwater pumping to make up for the reduction in surface water supplies and to cover additional future water demands, the Proposed Project will cause the City to suffer a water supply shortage.	natural or physical boundaries as appropriate to the particular resource being assessed. For example, for groundwater resources, impacts are assessed for each groundwater subbasin underlying the plan area; for agricultural resources, impacts are assessed for each irrigation districts in the plan area; for service providers, impacts are assessed for each sub-watershed underlying the plan area. Please refer to Appendix F.1, Hydrologic and Water Quality Modeling and Appendix G, Agricultural Economic Effects of Lower San Joaquin River Flow Alternatives: Methodology and Modeling Results, for a detailed description of the models and related assumptions used to evaluate impacts. For further discussion regarding the requirements of CEQA as they pertain to a program-level analysis, please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments. Neither the plan amendments nor the SED require or advocate increased groundwater pumping to offset the reduction in surface water. The SED merely reflects that historically a standard response at a local level to a reduction in surface water availability has been to pump more groundwater. Precise actions that local entities would take in response to implementation of the plan amendments, with or without the future condition of SGMA, are in the hands of local entities. SGMA and the plan amendments are not in conflicts with each other. The State Water Board assumes that if local water users decide to replace the reduced surface water supply with groundwater, they could do it up to the levels associated with 2009 and 2014 infrastructure. For a discussion on modeling assumptions of the level of pumping associated with 2009 and 2014 infrastructure in the WSE model, please see Master Response 3.2, Surface Water Analyses and Modeling. For further discussion on consideration of SGMA and compliance with SGMA in the context of the plan amendments, please see Master Response 3.4, Groundwater and the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act.
1162	13	The Proposed Project's Cumulative Impacts on the City's [Modesto's] Water Supply Must Be Analyzed. CEQA requires lead agencies to answer two questions to determine whether a project will have cumulative impacts. First, the agency must determine whether the effects of the proposed project, in combination with other projects, would be cumulatively considerable. If so, the agency must then evaluate whether the project's incremental contribution is cumulatively considerable. Communities for a Better Environment v. California Resources Agency, 103 Cal. App. 4th 98, 120 (2002), disapproved on other grounds in Berkeley Hillside Preservation v. City of Berkeley, 60 Cal. 4th 1086, 1109 n. 3 (2015). When the project's incremental effect is cumulatively considerable, the EIR must discuss the project's cumulative impacts. San Francisco Baykeeper v. State Lands Comm'n, 242 Cal. App. 4th 202, 222 (2015). On the other hand, if the cumulative impact is insignificant or if the project's incremental contribution to the impact is not cumulatively considerable, the EIR need not conduct a full cumulative impacts analysis, but it must include a brief explanation of the basis for the agency's conclusions. San Francisco Baykeeper v. State Lands Comm'n, 242 Cal. App. 4th 202, 222 (2015). A project's cumulative environmental impact cannot be deemed insignificant merely because its individual contribution to an existing environmental problem is 1·elatively small. San Francisco Baykeeper v. State Lands Comm'n, 242 Cal. App. 4th 202, 223 (2015), citing Kings County Farm Bureau v. City of Hanford, 221 Cal. App. 3d 692, 718-21 (1990). To the contrary, "the greater the existing environmental problems are, the lower the threshold should be for treating a project's contribution to cumulative impacts as significant." San	Please see Master Response 6.1, Cumulative Analysis, for information related to the adequacy of the programmatic cumulative analysis with respect to service providers. Please see Master Response 3.4, Groundwater and the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act, regarding a discussion of SGMA and its relationship to the plan amendments and evaluation in the SED. The cumulative analysis of groundwater in Chapter 17, Cumulative Impacts, Growth-Inducing Effects, and Irreversible Commitment of Resources, states: "Overall, the LSJR alternatives would reduce the amount of surface water available to those entities that currently divert surface water. To replace reduced surface water supplies, these entities could increase their reliance on groundwater, thereby increasing groundwater pumping and reducing groundwater recharge, relative to the baseline water balance, in the four groundwater subbasins underlying the plan area (the Eastern San Joaquin, Modesto, Turlock, and Extended Merced Subbasins)." It concludes that the "incremental contribution to groundwater resource impacts from LSJR Alternative 2 with adaptive implementation or LSJR Alternatives 3 or 4 with or without adaptive implementation would be cumulatively considerable when viewed in connection past, present, and probable future projects…" The State Water Board discloses whether other water sources exist and what environmental impacts would result, in at least general terms, from the use of those other sources, in Chapter 13, Service Providers, and Chapter 16, Evaluation of Other Indirect and Additional Actions. In Chapter 13 it is acknowledged that the potential impacts due to surface water reductions are considered within the general context of water supply agreements and contracts of different service providers in Impact SP-1. Please refer to Master Response 3.6, Service Providers, regarding the availability of municipal water supply. In Chapter 16, other actions are described that could be taken to augment water supplies, including their cost and potential environmental impacts (see Section 16.2, Lower San Joaquin River Alternatives—Other Indirect Actions. Broad cumulative

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		Francisco Baykeeper v. State Lands Comm'n, 242 Cal. App. 4th 202, 222 (2015); Communities for a Better Environment v. California Resources Agency, 103 Cal. App. 4th 98, 120 (2002). Proper analysis of the cumulative impacts on groundwater supplies must consider the impacts of the Proposed Project in combination with all future conditions that will constrain these supplies, including implementation of SGMA, multi-year droughts, and more stringent drinking water standards. The Proposed Project will reduce surface water deliveries, which will cause increased demand for, and pumping of, groundwater. In the future, groundwater supplies will also be constrained as SGMA is implemented and parties are prohibited from extracting more than the "safe yield" of the groundwater basins. Furthermore, as we have seen during the recent drought conditions in 2014-15, water users turn to groundwater in critical dry periods when surface supplies are unavailable. Droughts are a reasonably foreseeable fact of life in California, and agencies must evaluate the potential impacts of a project during future drought conditions. Voices for Rural Living v. El Dorado Irrig. Dist., 209 Cal. App. 4th 1096, 1111-12 (2012). Imposing higher instream flows and reducing surface water supplies to the City and other users while simultaneously curtailing their access to groundwater supplies will obviously affect the reliability of their water supplies. Those impacts will be even more severe in very dry years when demand for groundwater is higher. The Revised Draft SED makes no attempt to analyze these impacts. Rather, it simply dismisses these reasonably foreseeable impacts as "speculative." At the "Technical State Water Board Staff/ Community Water Interests Meeting" held on November 18, 2016, the City's Director of Utilities, Larry Parlin, inquired about this and received the following response from Deputy Director of Water Rights Les Grober: MR. PARLIN: Reductions in water supply to the urban users. Because the primary focus that everybody is talking about and is appropriate is the agricultural community, and that's important. However, there are not -- Modesto is not the only urban water user that gets from an irrigation district in the local area. You have the cities of Manteca and others that get it from South San Joaquin Irrigation District. So did you look at the protection of that drinking water supply going forward as --for the urban water users, or are you just considering this all as agricultural water use and not looking at the fact that the urban water users do use some of that water supply? MR. GROBER: As you pointed out, we identify the use in the -- in the documents, and that's why we identify -- and, again, it's the -- much of the same unsatisfying answer in terms of, you know, the speculative elements. We talk about, you know, water conservation, you know, what's happened in recent drought periods in terms of, you know, reduced reliance on water, what can be achieved. We also talk about water transfers and sales of water and the costs of water, marketing of water. So those were all things that -- you know, what the exact mix of that will be is, you know, cannot be determined with specificity so it would be speculative. But there for the cities, because it is the highest use of water, and I think we even have language in our water quality control plan in terms of, you know, protecting health and safety, things like that, there's -- there are opportunities for purchasing water and for water to get to cities. A true and correct copy of the transcript of this meeting is attached as Exhibit F. [ATT 6]	effects associated with these different actions are addressed in Chapter 16, Section 16.7, Cumulative Impacts. Please see Master Response 2.3, Presentation of Data and Results in SED and Response to Comments, regarding the cumulative distributions presented in the impact analysis and the use of cumulative distributions to identify drier years.

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment	Response
		The City has two sources of water supply, surface water from the Tuolumne River under its contract with Modesto Irrigation District and groundwater. The Proposed Project will reduce the former and put increased strain on the latter, which will already be reduced due to SGMA and future drought conditions. The Revised Draft SED must disclose and analyze the Proposed Project's incremental contribution to these water supply impacts. See, e.g., Napa. Citizens for Honest Government v. Napa. County Bd. of Supervisors, 91 Cal. App. 4th 342, 373 (2001) [when project has uncertain impact on water supplies, EIR "cannot simply label the possibility that [water supplies] will not materialize as 'speculative,' and decline to address it"; the EIR must disclose whether other sources exist and what environmental impacts would result, in at least general terms, from the use of those other sources].	
1162	14	The Revised Draft SED Must Also Analyze the Urban Decay That Will Result If the State Water Board Adopts Any of the Proposed Lower San Joaquin River Alternatives. The State Water Board must undertake a thorough analysis of the economic devastation that could befall Modesto (and other urbanized areas of the Central Valley) if the project were implemented as currently proposed. CEQA also requires the analysis of the physical impacts that will directly or indirectly result from the forecasted economic or social effects of a proposed project. Subdivision (e) of CEQA Guidelines section 15064 provides that when the economic or social effects of a project cause a physical change, this change is to be regarded as a significant effect in the same manner as any other physical change resulting from the project. "[I]f the forecasted economic or social effects of a proposed project directly or indirectly will lead to adverse physical changes in the environment, then CEQA requires disclosure and analysis of these resulting physical impacts." Bakersfield Citizens for Local Control v. City of Bakersfield, 124 Cal. App. 4th 1184, 1205 (2004). The SED acknowledges that the surface water supply reductions imposed by the proposed Lower San Joaquin River alternatives will be substantial enough that current water users will need to seek new sources of water to support their future growth and development. The State Water Board has not identified any sources of replacement water and has undertaken no study of the economic effects of the proposal on the City of Modesto's urban economy. Rather, the SED simply dismisses these impacts, saying they are all speculative to evaluate. As discussed above, the project's proposed surface water reductions will prevent growth and hinder proposed economic development, and the impacts will be of such a size and scope that they will alter the regional economy. As such, they will contribute to urban decay, which must be analyzed as an element of the State Water Board's environmental review. Moreover, many of the jobs and most of the households in Modesto are directly or indirectly dependent upon a vibrant agricultural economy. Given this fact, neither the City of Modesto nor the surrounding region can absorb job losses of the magnitude that will likely result from the implementation of the proposed project without substantial urban decay. As the Bakersfield Citizens court noted: It is apparent ... that proposed new shopping centers do not trigger a conclusive presumption of urban decay. However, when there is evidence suggesting that the economic and social effects caused by the proposed [project] ultimately could result in urban decay or deterioration, then the lead agency is obligated to assess this indirect	The comment speculates, without supporting facts, that because the plan amendments would create a potentially significant change in agricultural water use that there will be urban decay. However, urban decay is not a generalized condition or a reasonably foreseeable secondary consequence of the plan amendments. Urban decay is a potential effect of a project when the indirect economic impact it creates (generally retail competition) is concentrated upon existing commerce such that it is reasonable to conclude there could be a ripple effect of store closures and long-term vacancies that would eventually result in general deterioration and decay in a specified area. For example, in the case cited in the comment, Bakersfield Citizens for Local Control v. City of Bakersfield, the City of Bakersfield approved two retail "supercenters" that were only 3.6 miles apart and had a combined total of 1.1 million square feet of retail space. As the commenter notes, because of the projects' specificity, including size, the type of retailers they were, their market areas, and their proximity to other similar retail, urban blight was reasonably foreseeable. That conclusion is consistent with Citizens Assn. for Sensible Development of Bishop Area v. County of Inyo (1985) 172 Cal.App.3d 151 (county should have analyzed whether a proposed shopping center would compete with the downtown business district thus forcing business closures and eventual physical deterioration of the downtown area); and, Citizens for Quality Growth v. City of Mt. Shasta (1988) 198 Cal.App.3d 433 (saturation of the market with new retail was likely to result in the closure of existing retail). SED Chapter 20, Economic Analyses, and Appendix G, Agricultural Effects of the Lower San Joaquin River Flow Alternatives: Methodology and Modeling Results looked at the potential economic effects of the plan amendments on agricultural employment as well potential regional economic effects. The SED analyses acknowledge that because the plan amendments require greater instream flows there will be a reduction in water supplies available for irrigation and this in turn will cause a potential reduction in agricultural production, jobs, and interrelated sectors and institutions in the regional economy. Agriculture is an important economic sector but as described in Appendix G, it represents 2.7%, 2.8%, and 4.5% of the total annual tax revenues in San Joaquin, Stanislaus, and Merced Counties respectively. In addition, as reflected in Chapter 20 and Appendix G, those effects are primarily spread over seven different irrigation districts in those counties. Therefore, the commenters' conclusion that a general loss of wealth results in the concentrated physical impact of urban decay and thus the SED was required to make a specific finding regarding urban decay is unreasonable and unsupported by either the SED analyses or case law, including the case cited by the comment. Please also see Master Response 8.2, Regional Agricultural Economic Effects, and Master Response 8.4, Non-Agricultural Economic Considerations, related to potential agriculture and municipal growth and development impacts, respectively.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments			
Ltr#	**Cmt#**	**Comment**	**Response**
		impact. Many factors are relevant, including the size of the project, the type of retailers and their market areas and the proximity of other retail shopping opportunities. The lead agency cannot divest itself of its analytical and informational obligations by summarily dismissing the possibility of urban decay or deterioration as a 'social or economic effect' of the project. Loss of surface water supplies will result in a substantial loss of agricultural industry wealth in Modesto; loss of wealth will result in a substantial degradation of Modesto's urban environment. The potential for substantial urban decay in Modesto that would result from the project mandates that the Board undertake a comprehensive analysis of the physical impacts the project will have on urban water customers and the domestic economy prior to project approval.	
1162	15	Implementation of the proposed Water Quality Objectives would impose severe reductions on the City's [Modesto's] surface water supplies and cause increased demand for groundwater pumping, both of which will have direct and indirect impacts on the City as a municipality and as a utility. Moreover, the SED itself acknowledges that there are no known sources of replacement supplies. However, the Revised Draft SED fails to undertake the statutorily required balancing of interests, nor does it accurately disclose, quantify or analyze the impacts to the City. Thus, the Revised Draft SED is fatally deficient. More critically, if the impacts to the City had been properly assessed, the State Water Board would realize that the Proposed Project threatens to strike a potentially fatal blow to the City's growth, development and economy.	Please refer to Master Response 1.1, General Comments, regarding the programmatic nature of the SED's analysis and Master Response 8.4, Non-Agricultural Economic Considerations, addressing the economic-related topics of potential effects on growth, economic development, and urban decay in the plan area. Chapter 13, Service Providers clearly articulates the potential effects on municipal water providers, including the City of Modesto. Chapter 16, Evaluation of Other Indirect and Additional Actions, clearly identifies several potential actions that could be taken to replace surface water supplies.
1162	16	We [City of Modesto] urge the State Water Board to carefully consider the impacts that its decision will have in the real world, on the real people who make up our community. If this process continues and the matter comes before the Board for a decision, we hope that the State Water Board members will exercise the utmost care in carrying out their statutory obligation to strike an appropriate balance amongst the competing uses of this water - and we respectfully suggest that none of the existing Lower San Joaquin River alternatives meets this standard.	Please see Master Response 1.1, General Comments, acknowledging the concerns of elected representatives and other community members. Please also see Master Response 1.1 and Master Response 1.2, Water Quality Control Planning Process, for information regarding the consideration of beneficial uses.
1162	17	[ATT 1: Amended and Restated Treatment and Delivery Agreement Between Modesto Irrigation District and the City of Modesto]	The commenter provided this attachment for reference purposes in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in these responses to comments; therefore, no additional response is required. Further, the attachment does not either make a general comment regarding the plan amendments or raise a significant environmental issue.
1162	18	[ATT 2: City of Modesto – 2015 Urban Water Management Plan]	The commenter provided this attachment for reference purposes in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in these responses to comments; therefore, no additional response is required.
1162	19	[ATT 3: ATT 1: Contour map of Modesto Groundwater Basin, Spring 2001, Linda of Equal Elevation of Water in Wells, Unconfined Aquifer]	The commenter is providing this attachment for reference purposes in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in these responses to comments; therefore, no additional response is required.
1162	20	[ATT 3: ATT 2: Contour map of Modesto Groundwater Basin, Spring 2010, Linda of Equal Elevation of Water in Wells, Unconfined Aquifer]	The commenter is providing this attachment for reference purposes in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in these responses to comments; therefore, no additional response is required.
1162	21	[ATT 3: ATT 3: Duplicate contour map of Modesto Groundwater Basin, Spring 2010, Linda of Equal Elevation of Water in Wells, Unconfined Aquifer]	The commenter is providing this attachment for reference purposes in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in these responses to comments; therefore, no additional response is required.
1162	22	[ATT 4: Report: The Economic Impact of Food and Beverage Processing in California and Its Cities and Counties, dated January 2015]	The commenter provided this attachment for reference purposes in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in these responses to comments; therefore, no additional response is required.

Table 4-1. Responses to Comments			
Ltr#	**Cmt#**	**Comment**	**Response**
1162	23	[ATT 5: Statecon Inc. Report: The Economic Consequences of the Proposed Flow Objective for the Lower San Joaquin River in Merced, San Joaquin and Stanislaus Counties. Dated December 2016]	Please see Master Response 8.2, Regional Agricultural Economic Effects, regarding the State Water Board's evaluation of potential regional economic effects associated with change(s) in agricultural production, and a discussion on surface water supply reliability. As discussed in Master Response 8.2, while the 2016 Recirculated Draft SED's analyses and conclusions differ from the commenter's, the SED's analyses are supported by reasonable assumptions, substantial evidence, and an appropriate level of analysis for considering economic effects. Responses to comments provided in the Stratecon Inc. Report referenced are provided in letter 1176.
1162	24	[ATT 6: Transcript from Technical State Water Board Staff/Community Water Interests Meeting. November 18, 2016]	The commenter provided this attachment for reference purposes in support of their comments. Those comments are addressed in these responses to comments; therefore, no additional response is required.